12

# The Case of the Manchester Educationists.

PART II.

# A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE

## A COMMITTEE

OF

## THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

IN RELATION TO A SCHEME OF

## Secular Education.

BY JOHN HOWARD HINTON, M.A.

---

PREPARED AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A COMMITTEE FORMED IN LONDON FOR OPPOSING THE MANCHESTER BILLS.

---

LONDON:

JOHN SNOW, 35, PATERNOSTER ROW.

SOLD ALSO BY FLETCHER AND TUBBS, MANCHESTER.

1854.

LONDON:

J. HADDON AND SON, PRINTERS, CASTLE STREET, FINSBURY

# CONTENTS.


| | | Page. |
|---|---|---|
| Introduction | | 1 |
| Chap. I. | The Educational duty of the State | 6 |
| II. | The Voluntary System | 10 |
| III. | The Secular System—its Scope | 29 |
| IV. | The Secular System—its Teaching | 31 |
| V. | The Secular Scheme—its Deficiency | 43 |
| VI. | The Secular Scheme—its Supplement | 48 |
| VII. | The Secular Scheme—its Machinery | 55 |
| VIII. | The Secular Scheme—its Expediency | 66 |
| IX. | The Secular Scheme—its Expediency continued | 78 |
| X. | The Local and Secular Schemes compared | 86 |
| XI. | On Compulsory School attendance | 89 |
| Conclusion | | 95 |

# A REVIEW, &c.

## INTRODUCTION.

The present pamphlet connects itself, both by its title and its substance, with one which appeared in the autumn of 1852, "The Case of the Manchester Educationists." This was a review of the evidence taken before a Committee of the House of Commons in relation to the state of education in Manchester and Salford in the session of that year, and the pamphlet now in the reader's hands is a review of the evidence taken by the same Committee as re-appointed in the session of 1853, to prosecute to the end an inquiry which had been left incomplete The order for the re-appointment of the Committee was made on the 17th of February, and the nomination of its members took place on the 25th of the same month. It consisted of the following gentlemen :—

Mr. Milner Gibson.
Mr. Peto.
Mr. Bright.
Lord John Russell.
Mr. Pellatt.
Sir George Grey.
Mr. Ker Seymer.
Mr. Christopher.
Mr. Miles.
Mr. Bowyer.
The Marquis of Blandford.
Mr. Macaulay.
Mr. Cobden.
Mr. Fox.
Mr. Brotherton.

The constitution of the committee was considerably affected by the political changes which had taken place in the interval between its first and second session. One of its original number, Mr. Heald, had no seat in the new parliament, while four others—Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Bankes, and Mr. Monsell—were draughted off to situations more or less important in the new government, and the Committee thus lost some valuable members. Its leading men, however, still remained, and some care was taken to preserve, as nearly as might be, the representative position of the several parties to the inquiry by introducing the following gentlemen, Sir George Grey, Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Pellatt, Mr. Bowyer, and Mr. Christopher. Strenuous efforts were made on the part of the voluntary educationists to obtain the nomination of Mr. Hadfield, whose local knowledge derived from a long residence in Manchester eminently qualified him to take a part in the proceedings; but, owing to an objection somewhat tenaciously offered by Lord John Russell, whose position as Leader of the House of Commons gave to his feeling on such a matter something like a decisive weight, without success.

The Committee commenced their labours on the 7th of March, but the inquiry in their hands was not conducted with spirit. Generally speaking

the attendance was small and irregular, and the interest excited sensibly inferior to that which attended the proceedings of 1852. This is to be accounted for in part by the greater pressure of Committee business at the commencement of a new Parliament, aggravated especially in this instance by the unusual number of election petitions, in part by the aspect of diminished importance attaching to the labours of the Committee in consequence of the announcement that an educational measure would be brought forward by the government, and in part by the almost entire absence of one of the parties to the inquiry, the advocates of the local scheme, who seemed to consider their work as completed in 1852. In truth, according to the arrangement then made, it was the turn of the Secular Educationists now to speak, opportunity being reserved to the voluntaries to be heard in reply.

The case of the Seculars was accordingly brought forward. It was opened by Mr. Thomas Bazley, a manufacturer, and further developed by the Rev. Dr. M'Kerrow, who was under examination two days, and Dr. John Watts, who was under examination three days; one day was allotted to Mr. Thomas Binyon, of the society of Friends; one to the very Revs. John Kershaw and Lawrence Toole, Roman Catholic clergymen; one to Mr. Samuel Lucas, the Rev. W. J. Kennedy, and Mr. Leonard Horner, the latter two gentlemen being school inspectors; and one to myself, Mr. William Hindshaw, and Mr. William Salter, the latter two gentlemen being schoolmasters deputed by the Manchester Schoolmasters' Association. After this an attempt was made to obtain a hearing for Messrs. Curtis and Cuffe, (also Manchester Schoolmasters, and selected as friends of the Secular scheme) who attended the Committee, but found no quorum; and as their intended evidence was in consequence not taken, a letter from each of these gentlemen appears in the Appendix. The only portion of the evidence which was presented on behalf of the Voluntary Educationists was my own; request was made that other witnesses might be heard, but objections to this course were strongly urged, and it was indeed with difficulty that even a partial hearing was obtained for me. I was examined for about an hour and a half on the 29th of April; on the 6th of May, when I attended for re-examination, there was no quorum, and the substance of my intended evidence appears in a supplementary paper in the appendix. It seemed to be the idea of the Chairman of the Committee that the Voluntaries had been fully heard during the former session, and I found it necessary repeatedly to press upon him the fact, that as against the secular system, the Voluntaries had not been heard at all.

By the beginning of May the patience of the Committee seemed to be quite worn out, and nothing remained but to get them together, if possible, once more, in order to agree on a Report. On the 26th of that month this was effected, and the result is thus given to the world:—

"Committee deliberated.

"Motion made, and question, 'That the Evidence be reported, without any opinion thereon, to the House' (Mr. Peto) put, and agreed to.

"Ordered, To report Minutes of Evidence, (and Appendix) to the House."

Such is the "lame and impotent conclusion" of a grand educational movement in the legislature of Great Britain, running through two sessions of that illustrious body, and calling up at once the most fervent zeal and the most eminent wisdom of the friends of popular education, both in parliament and out of it. Such are the diversities of opinion which exist among educational philanthropists themselves, and the small degree of

progress made in settling the primary elements of the problem, that upon no one point could thirteen men picked out for the purpose from the whole House of Commons find their way to an agreement. So much for the possibilities of educational legislation in England.

While constituting an utter failure, however, as to the design of laying a basis for legislative action, the protracted inquiry which has been gone through cannot be otherwise than useful, in putting into the hands of the public all that is to be said by the advocates of the current educational movements respectively, and in thus supplying materials by which those who will direct their attention to the subject may be guided. It is true, parliamentary Blue Books are rather like graves in which the most precious things may be buried, than mines out of which people at large will take the trouble to dig them; but still there the precious things are, and to make access to them in the present instance somewhat more easy is the design of the pamphlet now in the reader's hands. I beg him to understand, however, that what he has before him is not a DIGEST of the evidence, intended simply to tell him what it is, but a REVIEW of it by one of the parties to the controversy; namely, by a Voluntary, and in the sense of the Voluntaries as an educational party. Of course, I mean to do justice to the whole evidence, and to make no use of means unworthy of fair discussion; but I write as a partizan. If I write inconclusively or unfairly, let me be exposed.

It will readily occur to the reader that, in the present instance I write under a peculiar disadvantage. In my former pamphlet I had to do with the evidence given by others, I have now to do in part with evidence given by myself. To the awkwardness inevitably arising from this circumstance I am far from being insensible, but I must contend with it as well as I can, since there is no other person but myself by whom the pamphlet can be written. This introduction I write in my own name; in the body of the pamphlet I shall adopt the editorial *We;* and I shall endeavour to deal with my own evidence in a feeling as nearly approaching to impartiality as possible. Should the reader think I am not absolutely successful, I must ask his allowance for my infirmity.

It would have very much abridged the labours of the Committee of 1853 if they had confined themselves, (as perhaps they might have done,) to an examination of the case of the Secular Educationists, without traversing a second time ground already well trodden by that of 1852; the witnesses, however, went without scruple into the whole question, and discussed elementary principles as though nothing had been said upon them before. In this respect a necessary regard to brevity warns me against following their example, since, if I were to do so, the pamphlet under my hand would become too bulky to be useful. I shall limit myself, therefore, to a notice of three principal topics—the educational duty of the State, the Voluntary system, and the Secular scheme; and I shall pass by the evidence on the Minutes of Council, on the Local scheme, and on Lord John Russell's bill. I shall omit also what pertains to a school rate and to free schools. Most of these topics—I may say, I believe, all of them but Lord John Russell's bill—not only were largely inquired into by the Committee of 1852, but are fully treated in my former pamphlet; and to these sources of information I beg to refer all parties desirous of further acquaintance with them.

To this list of excluded matters I reluctantly add Foreign Schools, both American and Dutch, on both of which evidence was taken to which I

should have been glad to refer, but again a regard to needful brevity restrains me. All I shall permit myself to do is cursorily to notice in this place a letter from the Rev. J. E. Thompson, of the United States, on the Common School System of New England, which was put in evidence by Mr. Cobden, and to which so much importance has been attached by the patrons of the Secular scheme as to cause its separate publication. In adverting to this letter, which is of great length, I shall not indulge myself in general remarks, but shall content myself with introducing a short passage from the papers supplementary to my own evidence, in which I have endeavoured to indicate what appear to me to be the weak points in Mr. Thompson's letter. The passage is as follows:—

The letter of the Rev. J. P. Thompson (576) on the common schools of the United States contains much valuable matter, but is open to several remarks. (1.) In one important matter of fact he seems clearly to be in error. He says, "The early common school system of New England was not constituted upon a religious basis;" a statement which the words of the original law, and various testimonies to be found in the papers presented by Mr. Twistleton to the Committee of last Session, and to be found in the Appendix to their Report, fully prove to be erroneous. (2.) Mr. Thompson wholly ignores the leading characteristic of the American schools; the object of which is, not merely, as he represents, that all should be educated, but that the children of all classes should be educated together, in order to foster a republican spirit. That it is for this political result chiefly that the schools are valued, is manifest from the papers of Mr. Twistleton before referred to. (3.) Mr. Thompson entirely overlooks the party upon whom education primarily devolves, namely, the parents. He speaks throughout as though there were no other alternative in respect of education than that afforded by the State on the one hand, and by religious sects on the other. This is surely* a false view of the subject. (4.) Mr. Thompson admits that the entire religious instruction of the young, reduced in the schools to an absolute minimum, is devolved on the Sunday schools; in my judgment a fearfully inadequate instrumentality. (5.) Mr. Thompson admits the dissatisfaction of the Roman catholics and of the Presbyterians with the schools, as far as their religious influence is concerned; and what he says of the press, which is a political organ, cannot prevail against the mass of private opinion elicited by Mr. Tremenheere, and given in his Notes.—*Appendix*, p. 258.

One topic more must be included in my list of omitted matters, namely statistics. These were again gone into to some extent; but without expressing any opinion as to the statements made, it seems to me enough —and best—to take the case as it has been authentically put by the registrar-general on the authority of the Census returns. For the information of those who may not have seen it, we here reprint that portion of the Parliamentary paper, (15th May, 1853, No. 487) which exhibits the general facts, and by a consideration of which any reader will be enabled to judge for himself of the state of popular education in England, so far as statistics can show it. As for the cry raised since the publication of this document, that statistics are deceptive and can prove nothing, it is obviously the mere wincing of parties who are galled by finding statistics against them; since the same parties appealed vehemently to statistics while they thought it for their advantage.

To all persons consulting the Blue Book I renew my caution, Beware of typographical errors; they are both numerous and important.

* Misprinted *merely*.

# STATE OF POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

*From the parliamentary return.*

Comparative View of the Number of Day Schools and Sunday Schools, and of the number of Day Scholars and Sunday Scholars, in England and Wales, in the years 1818, 1833, and 1851, with the Populations of those years respectively, and the proportions which the Day Scholars and Sunday Scholars respectively bore to the Population in each of those years.

| DAY SCHOOLS. | | | | | | SUNDAY SCHOOLS. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Schools. | | | Number of Scholars. | | | Number of Schools. | | | Number of Scholars. | | |
| 1818. | 1833. | 1851. | 1818. | 1833. | 1851. | 1818. | 1833. | 1851. | 1818. | 1833. | 1851. |
| 19,230 | 38,971 | 46,114 | 674,883 | 1,276,947 | 2,144,377 | 5,463 | 16,828 | 23,498 | 477,225 | 1,548,890 | 2,407,409 |

| POPULATION. | | | PROPORTION OF SCHOLARS TO POPULATION. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Day Scholars. | | | Sunday Scholars. | | |
| 1818. | 1833. | 1851. | 1818. | 1833. | 1851. | 1818. | 1833. | 1851. |
| Estimated, 11,642,683 | Estimated. 14,386,415 | 17,927,609 | One in 17·25 | One in 11.27 | One in 8·36 | One in 24·40 | One in 9·28 | One in 7·45 |

*Note.*—In the number of Schools here given for 1851 are included 1,206 Day Schools and 377 Sunday Schools, in the Returns from which the number of Scholars was not stated: the above numbers of Day Scholars and Sunday Scholars respectively include an estimate for these defective Returns; and the proportions for 1851 are based upon these full totals. In comparing the proportion of Scholars for 1851 with those for the previous years, it should be borne in mind that the Returns obtained in 1818 and in 1833 (especially those of 1833) were much less complete than those procured at the Census of 1851.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE EDUCATIONAL DUTY OF THE STATE.

This elementary but important subject is most systematically introduced by Dr. Watts, and we shall commence therefore with that part of his examination which relates to it.

541. *Chairman.*—Do you think that it is the duty of Government to endeavour to promote primary instruction? I do certainly. . . It seems to me that the sphere of Government is direct in this matter; its primary duty being to maintain society, and that the secondary duty of Government is to be an executive for the people. Education seems to me to be civilization, and it would be as rational, I think, to expect a cotton mule to turn out calico ready woven, as to expect an uneducated man to perform properly the duties of civilized life. General neglect of education for one generation would cast us back into barbarism; and it seems to me that what is necessary for society in the mass ought to be guaranteed to every individual composing that mass. We all start in life entirely ignorant, and every additional mechanical or other discovery throws the uneducated man still further behind. The only defence of society is, that it confers mutual benefits. But what benefit do the neglected in education derive from society? I confess myself unable to see the benefit which men derive, unless they are educated up to the necessary level to fit them for the duties of civilized life.

The first sentence in this paragraph is pithily expressed, and seems to contain the cream of Dr. Watts's educational philosophy:—"The sphere of Government is direct in this matter; its primary duty being to maintain society," and its second "to be an executive for the people." At a later period of the same gentleman's examination we meet again with the same statement, in a connexion which throws considerable light on its value.

862. *Chairman.*—Then you attach no great weight to the objection that is sometimes urged, that education is beyond the sphere of the Government?—My impression is, that the first duty of the Government is the preservation of society, and that its second duty is to do whatever work is delegated to it by the people, and that therefore education may be as fairly delegated to the Government as anything else.

On this fallacious and unwary statement the witness was immediately taken up by one of the shrewdest members of the Committee, Mr. Fox, who, as a secular educationist, saw in a moment (what Dr. Watts, practised debater as he is, evidently did not see) the advantage thus given to the advocates of the Local scheme.

863. *Mr. W. Fox.*—If the definition of the word education is made to include religious training, it goes beyond the province of Government? Yes, it does then go beyond the province of Government, as the whole of my evidence tends to show.

864. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—Provided it were delegated by the people to the Government, then upon your own principle it would be within the province of

the Government ? If delegated by the people *en masse* it would be ; and the only reason why the Government cannot take the religious teaching is, because all the people are not agreed on religion, and because religion is not a subject of experience, and therefore any error committed cannot be repaired

Dr. Watts is here betrayed into palpable inconclusiveness, inconsistency, and confusion. In the first place he argues that, since it is the duty of the Government "to do whatever work is delegated to it by the people," "*therefore* education may as well be delegated to the Government as any thing else;" which is a clear *non sequitur*. Even admitting the duty of the Government as laid down, it obviously infers nothing as to the nature of the matters which may properly be delegated to it. Dr. Watts, however, is immediately obliged to modify his first principle, and to allow that religious training, even if it were delegated to the Government by the people, would still be beyond its province ; and yet, in a desperate effort to maintain his consistency, he goes on to say that even religious training would be within the province of the Government if it were delegated to them by the people *en masse*. If we ask him how this could be, he explains, that "the *only* reason why Government cannot take the religious teaching is because all the people are not agreed in religion ;" and yet, upon recollecting himself, he finds there is another reason too, (which he had himself previously stated,) namely, that "religion is not a subject of experience, and therefore any error cannot be repaired"—a reason which, clearly, even a delegation by the people *en masse* could never supersede.

The absolute effect of delegation by the people, is thus fairly denied by Dr. Watts himself, and the question is again remitted to us, *what* may properly be delegated by the people to the Government? On this point Dr. Watts lays down the general principle that "the first duty of the Government is the preservation of society," and therefore, we are to infer, the first duty of the Government comprehends education. But, as religion also tends to the preservation of society, is religious teaching likewise the duty of the Government? To this Dr. Watts answers, No ; and we now rejoin—It is then evident that the duty of the Government in relation to society is not absolute but limited ; one admitted limit is prescribed by the nature of religion, and it is certainly possible that other limitations may exist.

In the latter part of the paragraph Dr. Watts assigns to Government the specific object of promoting civilization, and consequently education, because education is civilization. Far be it from us to question or depreciate the civilizing power of education, but we are sure Dr. Watts will admit that religion has at least an equal civilizing power ; and the assertion rests on his own authority that religious teaching is not within the province of the Government.

Dr. Watts affirms that with respect to education "the sphere of the Government is direct;" meaning, we suppose (for without any intention to be critical, we must confess that we do not know what a "direct sphere" is,) that the duty of Government to educate is primary and immediate. We can scarcely see our way to admit this ; for if this be so, then is the obligation universal, imperative, and exclusive. The state in this case has a right to educate, not only some, but all ; it not only has a right to educate all, but it is bound to educate all ; and it is nothing less than an intrusion on its province for parents of any class to educate their own children. Hard, but inevitable conclusions these. We have proof, however, in the course of his examination, that Dr. Watts does not really think that the

duty of the state to educate is of the nature of a primary obligation. Let him be heard.

859. *Chairman.*—It is said that the State ought not to interfere in the matter of education ; that it is the duty of the parent ; and that is an objection urged against national education ; how do you reply to that objection ?—The reply is, that if all parents exercised the right and performed that duty, it would pass unquestioned ; but to attempt to prevent the Legislature from dealing with the neglected children, is to assert, not the right to educate, but the right to neglect or to pervert ; which right once conceded, society is at an end.

Thus Dr. Watts plainly acknowledges the duty of the parent to be prior to that of the state—as, indeed, in the nature of things, it must be since the family is prior to society—and that of the state, of course, to be secondary and subordinate. What he contents himself with asserting here is the right of the legislature to deal with neglected children, which is taking very much narrower, and indeed undisputed ground.

A similar concession was extracted from Dr. M'Kerrow.

365. *Mr. Peto.*—With regard to the province of Government, is not the education of children primarily the duty of parents ; do you see no difference between the education of paupers and criminals, and the education of the working classes generally ? With respect to paupers and criminals, is not the State *in loco parentis ;* and would you have the State interfere with those who are educating their own children ; with those who can and show themselves unwilling, would it not be better to use persuasion to induce them to do their duty, than to take it out of their hands ; if the interest of parents could be awakened, might they not be relied upon to educate their children better than on any national system ?—I do not think we propose at all to interfere with the responsibility of the parents ; we, on the contrary, furnish them with the means of instructing their children according to the sense of their responsibility ; and if they have no interest in the instruction of their children, we imagine that society is bound to protect itself, and would be greatly benefited by bringing those children under instruction ; and that we are not to look merely to the circumstances of the parents, but more especially to the condition of society ; because if children are not instructed, of course they are growing up and forming vicious habits which are contracted in the streets. But there have been so many questions proposed at one time that I cannot retain them all.

The putting of "so many questions at one time" was certainly infelicitous, especially as explicit answers from the witness to the whole series would have been of considerable value ; shortly afterwards, however, we have a useful answer from this gentleman to a question put by itself.

380. *Mr. Peto.*—Does it not underlie* all voluntary educational effort that the people ought to educate themselves, and ought only to be helped as far as necessary, and temporarily ?—Certainly, if people have the means of educating their own children they ought to do it ; but if they neglect their duty, I do not see that that is any reason why we should allow the poor children to suffer for the neglect of the parents ; the parent may have no claim on society, but I think the neglected child has a strong claim on society.

Granted. "The neglected child has a strong claim on society ;" but Dr. M'Kerrow admits, let it be observed, that parents ought to educate their own children, and that the duty of the state herein begins only when parents neglect theirs.

* Misprinted *undervalue*.

From civilization Dr. Watts proceeds to criminal jurisprudence, a subject which he treats in the following manner.

542. Have you anything further to add upon the duty of Government in reference to criminal jurisprudence ?

Several answers now follow on the importance of people being taught to read the laws which they are to obey, a point on which we have no difference with Dr. Watts; we content ourselves with observing that nothing can be inferred from this beyond the obligation of government to teach those who are not otherwise taught. The real gist of this argument lies in the following passages.

548. It seems to me unjust to punish those who have not been educated. Idiots and lunatics are legally exempt, as not knowing, or not being able to control themselves in the doing of right or wrong. Now, men's capacities depend very much on their education, and it appears to me that responsibility should be in accordance with capacity, and with advantages, and that punishment is at best but a very clumsy expedient in place of education. The right of punishment seems to me to imply the right to prevent crime, for if that be not its object, punishment is gratuitous cruelty.

549. I wish to add, that if the right to punish crime be conceded, then it seems to me ridiculous to confine the Government to the worst possible mode of prevention, which is punishment. Gaol chaplains, schoolmasters, and industrial teachers may, and do, cure criminal dispositions, but punishment properly so called, that is, the infliction of pain, it seems to me never can.

550. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Would you give up punishment altogether ?—I would not abolish punishment at once, but it seems to me that the question of criminal jurisprudence requires to be wholly reconsidered. The history of the Warwick County Asylum for Juvenile Offenders, and of our various juvenile schools of industry, all prove the economy of reformatory measures, but prevention by education is much easier than reform. It would be the simple exchange of the policeman for the schoolmaster. I conclude, therefore, that it is clearly within the sphere of Government to guarantee education to all. The policy of such function in the hands of the Central Executive will remain to be considered, but I hold that wherever the tax-collector or the policeman penetrate that there the schoolmaster ought also to be known.

His colleague, Dr. M'Kerrow, expresses similar sentiments.

303. *Chairman.*—What is your next head ?—My next head refers to the general principle, that I think it comes within the province of Government, not merely to punish, but also to prevent crime ; not merely to repress social evils by the strong hand of power, but also to promote by active means the safety, public order, virtue, and the improvement of the community at large. I am aware that there are many things which it is not necessary for the legislature, nor for any association of people under the authority and arrangement of law, to do, which indeed neither the one nor the other ought to do ; but it does not follow that there is nothing which they should not prosecute in this manner ; and I cannot understand why it should be considered right to support the poor, and to carry on measures of sanitary improvement under national authority, and by means of legal association, and wrong to adopt the same method of diffusing the blessings of moral and secular instruction. Neither can I perceive why we should be permitted to enlighten the mind and discipline the heart of a child when it becomes a pauper or a criminal, and wrong to attempt to save him from ignorance and vice until he becomes an inmate of a workhouse or a gaol.

In another place the same witness pointedly affirms, that "the right to educate is the only justification of legal punishment," (351.)

The proposition here maintained is, that, in the arrangements of society,

the obligation to educate is a necessary correlative of the right to punish. Our reply to this would be, that, in this case, the obligation of the Government to educate must, since the right to punish is universal, be universal also, and comprehend, both all classes of the community, and all the elements of education—a conclusion we should suppose far from universally agreeable. We should rather say, that, since the education of children is primarily a parental duty, it is for social purposes presumed to take place within the domestic circle, and that it cannot be regarded as devolving upon society in any other cases than those in which it is, either by destitution or neglect, left undone by parents or next friends. If the educational obligation of the state is allowed to go beyond this line, there is no consistent reasoning by which it can be withheld from superseding parental rights altogether. A secondary and subordinate obligation would thus be allowed to annul and absorb a primary and immediate one.

It is clear to me, says Mr. Hinton, that one and the same thing cannot, at one and the same moment, be the duty of two distinct and incompatible parties; and if this be so, then I say that the education of children cannot be the duty of the State, because it is the duty of parents; a general principle which is allowed to "pass unquestioned" by Dr. Watts himself (859).—*Appendix*, p. 243.

And to Dr. M'Kerrow's statement he thus replies:—

Dr. M'Kerrow says he cannot perceive "why the State should be permitted to enlighten the mind and discipline the heart of a child when he becomes a pauper, and not to save him from ignorance and vice before he becomes an inmate of a workhouse or gaol," (303.) To my mind there is a reason for this, namely, that in the latter case the State is *in loco parentis*, and in the former it is not.—*Appendix*, p. 243.

It might be observed further upon this topic, that, as for civilization generally, so for the prevention of crime in particular, nothing is so powerful as religious training; but religious training is admitted not to be within the province of the Government, and consequently the duty of the Government as to the prevention of crime is not an absolute but a qualified and restricted one. In further illustration of this point we introduce the following remarks of Mr. Hinton.

Much stress has been laid upon a proposition put in this form, that, as the Government must be a moral administrator, so it may be a moral teacher; and some parade has been made by Sir Kay Shuttleworth of the name of the Rev. Dr. Vaughan (because he happens to be a Dissenter, I suppose), as supporting it. I totally deny the major term of this proposition, namely, that the Government must be a moral administrator. Lord John Russell, indeed, (Speech, p. 14),* directly asserts, that "it is the great duty of the State . . . . to enforce the observance of the rules of morality." This, I think, is assuming for human governments what is the exclusive prerogative of the Divine. But if this be really so, how is it that by far the greater part of our moral duties have their observance never once inquired into by Government? It is true, that some of the acts which the State punishes are breaches of the rules of morality—theft, for example; but the State punishes them, not as violations of morality, but as offences against society; else it would punish lying as well as theft, which it does not. Besides, if the State have charge of our morals, it must also have charge of our religion, out of which they spring. Lord John Russell saw this, and consistently claims for the State a right of interference in the religious, as well as the moral training of the people; while Dr. Vaughan, strange to say, so far agrees with him, as to admit that "it may be the duty

* April 10, 1853.

of Government to become a teacher of religion within certain limits." I might ask, when the intrusion is once permitted, who shall assign the limits? But I content myself with saying, that I totally differ from Dr. Vaughan, and that I believe he by no means represents the prevailing sentiment of English non-conformists. As for the religious instruction given in prisons, the reception of it, I believe, is optional with all criminals, except in the case of children, to whom the State stands *in loco parentis.*—*Appendix*, p. 243.

Dr. M'Kerrow draws an argument from the action of the government in relation to the support of the poor and the public health, and declares that he cannot "perceive why the Government may support the poor, and carry on measures of sanitary improvement, and yet may not diffuse the blessings of moral and secular instruction. Here again I reply, says Mr. Hinton, "that there are other and prior parties upon whom this last duty is charged by a supreme authority, and by one which all governments are bound to revere; while the support of the destitute poor, and the guardianship of the public health, are social objects, for which no such providential provision has been made."—*Appendix*, p. 243.

The argument from the support of the poor Dr. M'Kerrow elsewhere puts in a more stringent form.

326. If the parents cannot, or will not, give necessary food to the body of the child, no one will assert that he must be left to die of hunger, but all will admit that he should receive parish relief. I argue, that mental food should be given in like manner when circumstances so require.

To this Mr. Hinton makes the following reply.

We have been reminded that the Government does see to the fulfilment of parental functions—those of feeding and clothing children for example—when parents neglect them (326). Now I desire nothing better than the position thus given me. First, this is practically giving up the matter in debate, by acknowledging that it is not the part of Government to take on itself parental duties, except in case of neglect by the parents themselves. Secondly, I am quite willing to allow the Government to do as to education what they do as to food and clothing. Government provides for the feeding and clothing of neglected children only when the actual neglect, and its incurable character, are well ascertained; then sparingly and for a time, and never without endeavouring to bring back the parents themselves to the fulfilment of their duty; all these precautions being observed lest too great readiness in this matter should be a bounty on parental negligence. Let a similar course be pursued in respect of education, and I am satisfied.—*Appendix*, p. 243.

Another argument in favour of a system of state education was elicited from Mr. Bazley by leading questions from the Chairman, in the following manner.

33. *Chairman.*—Do you see any great evils in the district with which you are acquainted arising from the postponement of this question of promoting the general education of the people?—Yes, I think that the prolongation of ignorance is a very great evil, not only to the country at large, but to the unfortunate victims of it.

35. Even from economic and commercial considerations you are of opinion that the time is come when the most serious attention should be given by the State to this question of national education?—I regard better information and more instruction being afforded to the people as indispensable in the progress of the world, especially in the progress of this country. We shall lose our position unless our people be better informed.

37. Is not it distinctly, therefore, the interest of England to place all those

means of improvement within the reach of the working classes here, so that they may be tempted to give us the benefit of their labour, rather than carry it to the capitalists of foreign nations?—Clearly so. I believe if the people were better instructed they would be more profitable to themselves, to their employers, and even to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for I believe they would be contributors to the taxation of the country to a much greater extent than they now are.

It is somewhat singular, we think that Mr. Milner Gibson should speak of the present period as characterized by a "postponement of the question of the general education of the people." Our opinion, we confess, is widely different. It seems to us that there is no subject on which more earnest attention is bent, or on which there is making more rapid and encouraging progress. The Right Honourable gentleman, however, must doubtless be understoodto speak of education by law. And this it appears he would proceed to establish on the purely economical grounds indicated in his questions. To us the passage reads strangely, and we scarcely know what better to do with it than to request our readers to peruse it again. Of course we can have no objection to our manufacturing operatives being made "more profitable to themselves, to their employers, and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer," than they now are, although we think the last two of these reasons for a national system of education may as well be somewhat gently breathed into the ears of the parties immediately concerned; but we venture to ask the Chairman of this Committee, why education, in order to its becoming as general and as profitable as it can possibly be, should be attended to by the State, and be provided for by law? The assumption contained in all these questions, that the education of the people cannot become either thus general or thus profitable unless it be national—that is State-conducted—as it is obviously unproved, so it is to us clearly untrue; and the hankering after a national system is, we suspect, founded, not upon reason, but upon feeling. On this subject the following remarks are made by Mr. Hinton.

I am aware that there is a strong feeling in some quarters towards a national system of education of some kind, and I think it is easily accounted for. It is, in my judgment, the impatience of benevolent minds. We have been awakened by the loud cry of the deficiency of popular education, and are eager to supply it; so eager, that we cannot be content with judiciously accelerating the rate of our present progress, but unwisely grasp at the greatest-looking powers within our reach for instant effect. We clamour to go by the express train, instead of which we are getting into the parlimentary. This morbid affection of the public mind may safely, in my judgment, be left to effect its own cure. On the one hand, when those who now pine for it are satisfied that there really is no plan upon which a practicable system of national education can be formed, they will perhaps see the wisdom of relinquishing the attempt. On the other hand, the intensity of the feeling is not unlikely to be alleviated by the revelations of the Census of 1851, which so unexpectedly shows our rate of progress to have been so much more rapid, and our point of advance so much more considerable, than had been supposed. Not only Mr. Joseph Kay, but Sir Kay Shuttleworth, and the distinguished writers, philanthropists, and statesmen who have permitted themselves to be led by him, must have found this document a sensible refrigerator.

It has been said that we are likely to risk great public mischiefs if some national system of education be not adopted, but I have never heard this proved. Ignorance and vice prevail to a certain extent, it is true, but these are no novelties in the state of England, nor is there any special hazard, that I know of, arising from them just now. I can recollect times far more adapted to inspire apprehension than the present. The advancement of popular education is

undoubtedly of great importance, but there is nothing particularly important in this being effected by a national system ; on the contrary, it would, in my judgment, be far more desirable that the end should be arrived at by a general parental fidelity, than by any action of the Government at all. How very little can be expected from a system of education merely as national, may be gathered from the following sentence in the Report on Popular Education, recently presented by M. Eugene Rendu to the Emperor of the French : " Germany at the present hour pauses bewildered, and smites her breast ; in education as well as philosophy, she asks, ' Where am I ?' This is loudly confessed."—*Appendix*, pp. 242, 243.

An argument against a system of state education is introduced by Mr. Hinton in the following terms :—

On this subject it may be observed further, that in all cases duties and rights are correlative ; what it is my duty to do to another, he has a right to demand from me. The general proposition, consequently, that it is the duty of the Government to educate the people, involves its correlative, that the people have a right to education from the Government, and if a right to education, surely also to other things besides. I ask whether there is any more reason for the Government educating the people, than there is for putting them apprentice, and providing them with farms and trades after they are educated ? The proposition seems to me to be the root of the whole system of communism ; a root which, if nourished, may not be long in growing up to an inconvenient fruitfulness.—*Appendix*, p. 243.

In connexion with this may be placed a passage in the examination of Dr. Watts.

861. *Chairman.* Might it not be said that the right to education implied the right to food and clothing, and all other necssaries?—It is frequently said so, and, as far as the wholly neglected are concerned, it is a substantially good argument.

But, if this " is a substantially good argument as far as the wholly neglected are concerned," will Dr. Watts have the goodness to show why it is not an equally good argument in the case of rest of the population ? On what ground can I have a right to education at the hands of the Government, on which also I shall not have a right to other benefits ? Just now we had Dr. M'Kerrow inferring a right to education from the right to food ; is the logic less sound by which Mr. Hinton infers the right to food from the right to education ?

We may conclude this chapter with the following remarks by Mr. Hinton.

There is indeed one method in which, in my opinion, the Government might very powerfully aid the education of the people ; it is by abolishing the taxes on knowledge. The penny postage is believed to have given a more considerable impulse to education among the lower classes than all other causes put together ; and the abolition of the taxes on knowledge, by a universal cheapening of literature and of the means of acquiring it, would act with great force in the same direction. Indeed it seems inconsistent and contradictory to avow an intense desire to get the working classes educated, and at the same time to maintain a class of imposts, which, by making education costly, render it difficult of attainment. If the first wisdom of legislators be to take taxes off bread, on the same principle the second would be to take taxes off learning. Of the educational value of such a measure, a remarkable opinion has been given in Parliament by one of the leading advocates of the secular scheme. In the debate of April 14th, Mr. Cobden is reported to have spoken to the following effect : " After paying great attention to the question of national education,

I have arrived at the deliberate conviction that, in the interest of the great mass of the people, if I could see the taxes upon knowledge removed, I would agree to abolish any grant for education given by this House. I despair, at present, of seeing an efficient system of national education carried; but give me the removal of these impediments to knowledge, and I will willingly give up all the sums now voted for education."—*Appendix*, p. 244.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.

As, in this inquiry, the Voluntary educational system was represented by Mr. Hinton, it is proper that we should commence this chapter with some account of his evidence in relation to it.

1490. *Chairman.*—What are the sentiments generally of the parties you represent? The London Committee are Voluntary educationists in the fullest sense of the term. They hold that the education of children is the duty of parents; that it is a duty to which, with suitable stimulants and encouragements, pecuniary and otherwise, parents generally will attend; and that it is a parental duty with which the State ought not, unless in exceptional cases which may justify it in stepping *in loco parentis*, to interfere. They think that all needful aid may be supplied from voluntary sources, and they deprecate alike local rates and Government grants.

1626. In what sense do you use the word voluntary?—I use it in the sense in which it was defined in a resolution passed at a meeting of the friends of voluntary education, held at Manchester in the autumn of 1851, the terms of which are as follows: "Voluntary education is, and national education ought to be, the work of the people themselves, since the training of the child is essentially the duty of the parent, a responsibility which he cannot devolve on any classes, sects, or parties in the community; that the true purposes of education would be defeated if, on the one hand, parents should be compelled to educate their offspring, or, on the other, should succeed in compelling their fellow-citizens to provide for them the means of instruction; that all which enlightened patriotism and Christian benevolence can do in this matter, is to call the attention of parents to the duty of educating their children, to elevate, by all suitable means, the tone of popular thinking on this subject, to assist well-qualified persons in fitting themselves for the office of teachers, and to aid the really needy in their efforts to discharge a sacred obligation."

Mr. Hinton's citation of the Manchester resolution gave rise to the following cross examination.

1642. *Sir G. Grey.*—In this resolution which you have put in, it is stated, "that the true purposes of education would be defeated if, on the one hand, parents should be compelled to educate their offspring, or, on the other, should succeed in compelling their fellow-citizens to provide for them the means of instruction." What do you conceive to be the true purpose of education?—The development of a human being in his various faculties.

1643. Then would that purpose be defeated by a parent being compelled to send his child to school?—The true purposes of education comprehend both parent and child; there is a culture of the parental character in the fulfilment of that duty as well as the filial character, and the benefit of both would be materially diminished, if it were put out of its providential relation.

1644. How would the benefit to the parent and child be diminished in the case supposed of a child being compelled to attend an admirable school, contrasted with the case of a child attending no school?—The mischief of the latter would be the greater.

1645. Therefore, the true purpose of education would be more defeated by abstaining from compelling the parent to send his child?—Yes, in some cases doubtless.

1646. Would there not be exceptions?—Not if parental indifference can be cured by moral means; let the residue that is incurable by other means be so treated.

1647. Assuming that those moral means should fail of accomplishing the end, then you would consider the true purpose of education would not be defeated with regard to the residue of children left unprovided for, if they were compelled to attend?—Yes.

1648. It is also stated in this resolution, that "all which enlightened patriotism and Christian benevolence can do in this matter, is to call the attention* of parents to the duty of educating their children?"—That is, "properly do."

1649. You do not mean to say that it would be impracticable to do more; but with the opinions you entertain with respect to education, enlightened patriotism and Christian benevolence would exceed the bounds they ought to prescribe to themselves in so doing?—Yes.

Resuming the principal topic, the examination proceeded.

1627. *Sir G. Grey.*—Admitting that [education] to be the duty of the people, supposing you found that duty very imperfectly performed, would you not endeavour by other means to supply the deficiency?—I would limit those means to the absolutely defined neglect, if there be such cases, such as out-door paupers, the criminal population, and persons absolutely incorrigible, in which the State would be justified in acting *in loco parentis.* Then, as it does all the other duties of the parent, let it do the duty of education likewise.

1628. Suppose you found in the town of Manchester a large number of children of the lower class, who do not come within the description you have given, but who are not receiving education, would you not provide some means by which they might be brought within the reach of education, finding that the indifference of the parents had hitherto deprived them of the benefit of it?—Yes, by means of persuasion. I would employ educational missionaries and visitors, as proposed in the Secular Bill, but not requiring an Act of Parliament for the purpose.

1629. *Chairman.*—Supporting them by subscriptions?—Yes.

1630. *Sir G. Grey.*—If those moral means failed, would you feel yourself precluded from adopting any other means?—I would push them to their utmost extent before I would allow any such conclusion to be arrived at.

1631. Do you think the cause why education has not been more diffused is, that these means have not been pushed to their legitimate extent?—Yes.

We are now introduced to an argument on what has been briefly called the free-trade principle, which in its relation to education, Mr. Hinton treats at some length.

1632. *Chairman.*—You are not, then, in favour of the genuine voluntary principle, of leaving education absolutely to the law of supply and demand?—Not absolutely.

1633. You think somebody must interfere?—Yes.

1634. And the only person who must not is the State?—The State must not till all other parties have done their utmost.

1635. It [education] must not be left entirely to itself?—Not entirely.

1636. In what respect would you depart from it [the principle of supply and demand]?—I would depart from it in three respects: first, I would use active, and even costly endeavours to create a demand; secondly, I would do the same to create a supply; and thirdly, I would assist those to procure it who are really needy, and while they continue so.

1637. At whose expense?—At my own; others would join with me.

* Misprinted *recollection.*

1638. As a matter of charity?—Yes.

1639. You would confine your assistance within this limit? You would not, for example, establish free schools?—Certainly not, if I had the most ample and unbounded means. I consider that it is the duty of parents to provide for the education as truly as for the feeding of their children, and that this duty, like others, will be better discharged in connexion with the efforts and sacrifices with which Divine Providence has connected it. On this ground I would have all assistance rendered to parents strictly confined to those who are in need, and to the period in which they should continue so. Upon this I would beg to refer to two extracts from the "Edinburgh Review," which are as follows. Of the weekly pence the reviewer says, "They are the exponents of the affection of the parents, and of their desire to promote the best interests of their children. They express their sympathy with the work of the teacher, and are pledges that they will diligently second his labours at home, and cause their children punctually to attend the school. The parent who has not been encouraged to take an honest pride in providing, at the expense of some sacrifices, for the school education of his child, has lost the opportunity of a useful moral training for the home education of his child." (p. 489.) . . . . On this subject also I would refer to a passage from Dr. Wordsworth's Occasional Sermons, No. 22, page 126: "Take away from parents among the poor the inducement to make sacrifices for the education of their children; tempt them by an indiscriminate offer of eleemosynary education to disburden themselves of their children as an irksome and oppressive weight, and to cast them for instruction on a school rate, and transfer them to public tutelage; let the nation, by a general act of adoption, alienate the children of the poor from their parents, and appropriate them to itself; let the State be an universal stepmother, what would be the consequence? Children would be no longer regarded by a parent as a blessing for which he ought gladly to spend and be spent, in order that, by his own sacrifices for their education, they might be his crown of rejoicing at the great day. No; the nation would have proclaimed by public enactment that children are a burden from which the poor may reasonably desire to be discharged. Because some among the poor are in a very miserable condition, we ought not to adopt a system which would tend to demoralise them all. We ought not to injure the good and provident among the poor for the sake of the bad; and no condition of things can justify an outrage upon natural instincts, and a dissolution of domestic ties. Nothing can compensate for an infraction of parental rights and an abrogation of filial duties. Nothing can authorise a war against the sanctity of home."

1640. If the religious bodies came forward with large subscriptions and established schools, do you mean that those schools are to be self-supporting afterwards by school fees?—That would be my object: it is the object of the Congregational Board of Education, and of the Voluntary School Association.

1641. Your object would be merely to establish a school, to raise the school building, to put the thing in working order, and then to leave it to shift for itself?—Not for itself absolutely, but to help it into a self-supporting condition, just as I would teach a little child to go alone.

1652. You would have no permanent aid granted to parents?—None; that part of the system should be considered entirely temporary, and intended to issue in a state of things in which all parents should pay for the education of their own children. I would aim at bringing this part of the voluntary system to an end as soon as possible, its work being done.

1653. *Sir G. Grey.*—Do you anticipate that at an early period the parents of all classes of children in this country will be able to pay for their own children?—There is rapid progress towards it.

The examination here reverts to Q. 1636, in which Mr. Hinton had said that he would not leave education absolutely to the law of supply and demand, but would to some extent depart from it.

1665. *Chairman.*—I suppose you would not, even so far as this, interfere with the law of supply and demand in any other instance; that of clothing,

for example ?—Not except under peculiar circumstances, but under peculiar circumstances I might. Were I to find myself in a region where people went universally naked, for dress smearing over their bodies with palm oil and coloured clay, I might, as a matter of benevolence, be willing to lay out money in creating a demand for cotton shirts, and to distribute gratis a first supply. This is what missionary societies have done in Africa.

1666. And does any peculiarity attach itself to education that leads you to make it an exception to the rule you would otherwise observe in this country ?—Certainly. It is a case in which a great many parents are not so much alive as they should be to the highest interest of their children, therefore I would try to instruct and quicken them ; it is a case in which a good article is not to be had so fast as it is wanted, and as it is of the greatest importance it should be provided quickly, I would assist in the process ; and as there are some who would purchase, but at the moment are unable, I would help them. It is my conviction of the extreme importance of education which justifies me in so far taking it out of the category of articles of trade, and in dealing with it on a modified principle.

The examination being here interrupted, the conclusion of this argument is to be found in the Appendix, p. 244.

In my answer, 1632, I stated that I would not leave education absolutely to the law of supply and demand ; and in following answers I pointed out those respects in which I would depart from this law. I wish to illustrate this position by naming two other instances in which I would pursue a similar course. The first is religion, and the second is medicine. In the former case, if I find no demand I try to create one, and prepare to meet it with what I think the best supply, but with an intention ultimately to leave the party wholly to themselves ; in the latter case the demand may be presumed to exist, and if there be no doctors I help to send some, or if there be unskilful ones, I help to send better ; and I try to do this gratuitously till the people are able to pay for it. This is just what I would do in education.

It has been alleged that this action of benevolence in educational matters interferes seriously with the interests, and with what may be called the trade rights, of private schoolmasters, and this, no doubt, is the fact ; but so do hospitals and dispensaries with the interests of private practitioners, and so did the medical staff sent to Jamaica during the prevalence of cholera. It is in both cases the immensely superior importance of public interests which justifies the partial subordination of private ones.

Disposing thus of the free-trade argument, we return to the evidence.

1650. *Chairman.*—Suppose a number of persons agreed amongst themselves that it was desirable that a school should be established for the use of the children of their community, do you see anything adverse even to the voluntary principle, in their agreeing also that, instead of its being left to be supported by subscriptions, it should be supported by an equitable rate among them all ?—I think it very undesirable.

1651. What is the difference in principle between subscriptions to support a desirable object, and an agreement among the parties who want to have the object, rather than have an uncertain subscription, to settle at once that there shall be an equitable rate among them all ? Supposing a number of persons settle and agree that a given thing is desirable to be done, they may first of all attempt to do it by subscription, and finding that is inconvenient, settle that they will do it by an equitable rate ; what objection can there be to the latter course in preference to the former ?—No objection but such as may arise out of the nature of the object, if it be one which gives rise to difficulty.

1654. *Chairman.*—You do not carry your objection to a system of rates to support gaols or lunatic asylums, or any of the necessary objects of society ?—No ; nor would I object to a rate for education, if education could be shown to be a proper object of society. I deny that fundamental notion that education is a duty with which the State can rightly interfere, beyond the necessity

created for its interference by the absolute nonfulfilment of the parent's duty. If education was admitted to be a proper object of society I would give way.

1655. *Sir G. Grey.*—You do not object, according to your last answer, even to the imposition of a rate for the purpose of education, if you are satisfied that all the other means to which you have adverted have failed?—No, certainly not, as now for the education of paupers and criminals.

1656. Your objection to a rate is founded on the expectation which you entertain of the success of other means which to you are less objectionable?—Yes, it is my conviction that education is a parental duty; the parents are the parties to do it.

1658. *Chairman.*—Is not this the case with a rate levied on all property, that the parents in fact are doing more for themselves than under the voluntary system, inasmuch as they pay the rate first of all, and in return for the rate they get a school to which their children may have access?—But they do it much worse; separated from those moral influences which God in his Providence meant to be attached to the exercise of parental duties. If I pay a sum of money for the education of my child by self-denial, and you insist that I should pay for it through a rate, and get the same education, you rob me of the moral discipline, as a parent, which God meant for me, and which you have no business to take away.

1659. If the parent feels that he pays a rate in order to support the school, and that he has a right by law to send his child to that school to benefit by it, is he not very likely to do so?—Why do you put things out of the order of God's Providence? You make me provide that for myself by a rate which God meant I should provide as a parent for my children by a different state of feeling.

1660. The parent would have to pay for it somehow or other?—Yes.

1661. The question is, supposing he pays for it by a rate, what is the difference between his exercising his duty and his moral obligations, and so on, in that way, and his doing it by a subscription, or accepting it as a charitable contribution from somebody else; does not a rate system impose greater duties on parents, and make them sensible that they are bound to pay for the education of their children rather than to rely on charitable subscriptions?—Yes. You give me a comparison to draw between a rate in that respect and charitable subscriptions, but the proper comparison is between the rate and the parent paying for the schooling of his own child. Whether I pay for it by rate or personally, there is all the difference in the world between the motives that are brought into exercise in my own mind. If I do it personally, I do it in the proper culture and exercise of parental feelings. If I do it by rate all those feelings are put out of the question; it is a rate, and the collector, and constable, and so forth, come in; the entire state of feeling differs, and very perniciously.

1662. After paying the rate the parent would exercise his parental feeling by sending the child to school?—Perhaps so; but it is doing the thing in the worst way, I think, in which it can possibly be done.

1663. *Mr. Christopher.*—From the tenor of your evidence, and from your experience, do you think that all education ought to be conducted on the voluntary principle?—Yes.

Early in the examination (1657) Sir George Grey had put to Mr. Hinton a question as to his mode of explaining the failure hitherto of the voluntary system, to which, as interrupting the course of his argument, Mr. Hinton had postponed his answer. This important subject was now resumed.

1667. *Sir G. Grey.*—Now be so good as to answer the question I put to you just now?—Your question was, "To what do you attribute the failure, up to the present time, of means used for promoting education on the voluntary system?" Reserving to myself an opportunity of remarking hereafter on this alleged failure, I reply that, in my opinion, the philosophy of voluntary educational effort has been to a considerable extent misunderstood. In the first place, I think efforts to promote popular education on the voluntary prin-

ciple have erred by excess of benevolence. Not only was education put within the reach of the poorer classes, but it was presented to them gratuitously. We gave the children education when we should have encouraged their parents to purchase it. This error has been in part discovered and rectified, but its unhappy influence still lingers. The late Poet Laureate says on this subject: "I cannot but think that there is too much indiscriminate gratuitous instruction in this country, arising out of the misconception above adverted to, of the real power of school teaching relatively to the discipline of life, and out of an over-value of talent, however exerted, and of knowledge. If possible, instruction ought never to be altogether gratuitous. A child will soon learn to feel a stronger love and attachment to its parents, when it perceives that they are making sacrifices for its instruction. All that precept can teach is nothing compared with convictions of this kind. In short, unless book attainments are carried on by the side of moral influences, they are of no avail. Gratitude is one of the most benign of moral influences; can a child be grateful to a corporate body for its instruction? or grateful even to the Lady Bountiful of the neighbourhood, with all the splendour which he sees about her, as he would be grateful to his poor father and mother who spare from their scanty provision a mite for the culture of his mind at school? One of the most difficult tasks is to keep benevolence in alliance with beneficence. Of the former there is no want, but we do not see our way to the latter. Tenderness of heart is indispensable for a good man, but a certain sternness of heart is needful for a wise one. We are as impatient under the evils of society as under our own, and more so; for in the latter case, necessity enforces submission. It is hard to look upon the condition in which so many of our fellow creatures are born; but they are not to be raised from it by partial and temporary expedients." (Wordsworth's Occasional Sermons, No. 22, page 124, note.) Another error, in my judgment, has been committed in excluding the poorer classes entirely from the management, and from all share in the management, of the schools provided for their children. The management has been exclusively in the hands of gentlemen and ladies, of whose kindness I have to speak in the highest terms, but less highly, perhaps, of their discretion. Had it been possible to blend some of the more suitable of the poorer classes themselves in some manner with the managing committees, an interest might have been inspired, and habits of business might have been formed, which would have prepared the way for entirely relieving the higher classes of their toil. Instances illustrative of this have occurred to the Congregational Board of Education. A third mistake seems to have been committed by the promoters of popular education in selecting the kind of education to be given. This evil is twofold. First, the education has been too much of the nature of class instruction. It has been education for the poor, or for the working classes. A higher style of education is required in order to be attractive, as illustrated at King's Somborne, by the Dean of Hereford. Secondly, the education has been too exclusively literary. I beg to refer on this subject to the Report of the Rev. H. Moseley for 1851:—"From the time when I first had the honour to address to your Lordships a report on elementary education, I have not ceased to insist upon the importance of uniting with it some notions of a scientific kind with regard to such things as come under our daily observation. If ever we are really to educate the labouring classes, it must, I am sure, be by teaching them to reason and understand about those things which are connected with their ordinary pursuits; the things which concern every man's health or comfort, or out of which he is compelled to derive his livelihood. With the labouring man these things are so engrossing that, whatever else we may teach him when a little boy, these will infallibly put them out of his head when he comes to be a man. He labours on material things; it is his destiny; and he is capable of reasoning and understanding the properties of such things, and of deriving pleasure from so reasoning and understanding. To teach him the secret of that pleasure, and the advantage there is in the practical application of that knowledge, is to raise him in the scale of moral and intelligent beings, and, in as far as it depends on him, to

contribute to the well-being of society." (Minutes, 1852, vol 2, p. 9.) I think that, to the combined influence of these mistakes, much of the present embarrassment incidental to educational efforts on the voluntary system may be ascribed. They have been productive of three principal evils: first, a scarcity of funds; secondly, weariness of managers; and, thirdly, carelessness of parents. These are the principal hindrances to a rapid advancement of voluntary educational efforts. Of these the last (carelessness of parents) is the most powerfully operative, and the most difficult to overcome; but if it could be overcome, its cure would carry with it the cure of the other two. On this subject I hand in some extracts from the Report of the Rev. J. P. Norris for 1851 (Minutes for 1852, vol. 2, p. 378, *seq.*):—"Of all the hindrances that thwart teachers in their efforts to render their schools more efficient, and of all the difficulties that beset managers in providing resources for their support, the greatest and the most universally complained of is the want of co-operation on the part of the children's parents. I have asked nearly every schoolmaster in my district this question, 'What has been your greatest difficulty in the conduct of this school?' and the answer has been, almost without exception, 'The indifference of the parents.' Apathy, irregularity of attendance, the early age at which they leave, all the characteristic evils of our schools, are traceable in a great measure to this one source. Again, I have often asked clergymen whom I may have found defraying a great part of their school expenses out of very limited incomes, and raising money for the rest solely by their own unwearied exertions, 'What prospect is there of this school becoming in a greater degree self-supporting?' and in four cases out of five the answer has been, 'If we could only teach the parents to value the education offered to them, it might become so, or nearly so, to-morrow.' Of two things I am convinced: first, that without parental co-operation no endowments, no rate, no affluence of school provision, will really advance education; and secondly, that with parental co-operation, our schools, after being once fairly started, might be in a great measure independent on any such extraneous resources. The first of these propositions hardly needs comment or support. Money will do much; but it clearly will not in itself make a good school. It may build the fabric, furnish it with all possible appliances, and command the services of the best teachers; but it cannot fill the school with children, or secure their regular attendance, or retain them to an advanced age, without the concurrence of the parents. Unless the Legislature convert our day schools into boarding schools, and compel the children into them (which will hardly be in England), we cannot make ourselves independent of the parents' co-operation; nor, indeed, is it desirable. That the parents ought to feel responsible for their children's education is allowed by all. That the State, or the clergy, or a society, or a patron, should take it out of their hands, and do it for them, is clearly a second-best expedient; an argument that something is wrong, a concession to conditions (real or supposed) which we must all deplore. Earnest men have ever felt this. Dr. Chalmers, perhaps one of the greatest authorities that I could cite on this subject, writes: 'The only way of thoroughly incorporating the education of the young with the habit of families is to make it form a part of the family expenditure, and thus to make the interest and the watchfulness, and the jealousy of the parents so many guarantees for the diligence of their children; and for these reasons do we hold the establishment of free schools in a country to be a frail and impolitic expedient.' This passage, and still more his admirable address at the opening of one of the Glasgow schools, show that I might claim Dr. Chalmers' authority in support of my second proposition; also that, if the parents could be brought to value the education offered to them, our schools might be in a great measure self-supporting. It is a common notion that the bulk of them are not only unwilling, but really unable to pay such an attendance fee as would requite the services of a good teacher. Excepting pauper parents, whose case requires a separate consideration, I believe this to be untrue. I believe that most of the parents are quite able to pay for their children's education." After some extended and judicious remarks, Mr. Norris says: "Let us then consider how

far a compromise with parents would really involve a sacrifice of what is most valuable in education ; in other words, whether we should not do wisely to modify our theory of education by borrowing something from theirs" (p. 385). And he ultimately proposes what he calls a compromise, or concession, in the following terms : "The concession is this : not to persist in proposing the same type of school, and the same canon of instruction, to the rural village of Shropshire and the manufacturing town of Staffordshire ; but studiously to consult the industrial character of each locality, and, if possible, the bias of the people, and to accommodate thereto, more systematically than we have done hitherto, both the organization of the school and the direction of its teaching ; or, in one word, if I may adopt a common expression of the parents themselves, to make the schooling such as will pay" (p. 387).

In the Appendix Mr. Hinton adds to this exposition of the mistakes committed in the working out of the Voluntary principle, his promsied remarks on its alleged failure.

It has been often and loudly affirmed that the voluntary system has been tried and has failed, and a question was put to me (1657) in which this failure was assumed. I deny altogether, however, the correctness of this assumption. The only fact which can be adduced in support of it is the obvious and indisputable one, that the working classes of England are far from being as well educated as could be desired ; but this by no means establishes the allegation that voluntary educational efforts have failed.

First, because the existing state of our popular education, which, by the express admission of Lord John Russell in his recent speech, is "chiefly" to be ascribed to voluntary effort, is, with all its drawbacks, highly creditable to us as a nation. It should not be forgotten of how recent origin such effort is, and how brief has been the period of its operation. The first unendowed day school for the poor in England was founded in 1805. The first educational returns (Lord Brougham's) were in 1818, when the ratio of day scholars to the population was 1 in 17 ; the next educational returns (Lord Kerry's) were in 1833, when the ratio of day scholars to the population was 1 in 11 ; and the census of 1851 informs us (as stated to Parliament by Lord John Russell) that the ratio of day scholars to the population was then 1 in $8\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, according to the returns, the number of children attending day-schools increased, in 33 years (from 1818 to 1851) 212 per cent.; a rate of increase nearly four times more rapid than that of population, which during the same period was 57 per cent., and highly gratifying, to whatever deductions it may be liable. The ratio of day scholars to the population (1 in $8\frac{1}{2}$) places England among the best educated countries of Europe, and makes a near approximation to the ideal standard of the best educational statists, including Sir J. K. Shuttleworth. And this has been arrived at chiefly by voluntary effort (as an examination of the dates and Parlimentary grants would clearly show) in the short space of five-and-forty years.

Secondly, because great injustice is done to educational voluntaryism in the estimate usually formed of its results. A marked and singular niggardliness has been shown in admitting what is really due to it. Two instances of this may be appropriately noticed here.

Mr. Hinton here goes into an examination of a document which appeared in the appendix to the report of 1852, for which we refer the reader to the Blue book. He then proceeds.

(2.) The statements of Dr. M'Kerrow are liable to a similar qualification. He refuses to allow the force claimed for the argument from the actual results of voluntary educational effort, "because it is not to pure voluntaryism that the country is indebted for the progress which has been made" (334). I do not profess to know through what alembic the reverend gentleman makes the various voluntary educational efforts pass in order to distinguish the "pure" from the impure ; but I think that all such efforts of every kind are justly to be put down to the credit of the principle in which they originate, and regarded as illustrations of its power.

Thirdly, because a very extravagant and erroneous notion has been formed of what may be expected from educational voluntaryism. Dr. M'Kerrow was asked, for example, whether he thought the voluntary principle was adequate to the educational wants of the community, and he strongly asserted, that in his opinion it was not so (334, 379). But what is here to be understood by the voluntary principle? If, as seems natural, we understand by it the principle of aiding popular education by pecuniary contributions, then I object entirely to the matter being put in this form. In the words of a question put by Mr. Peto (379), I ask, "Why should voluntaryism be expected to be adequate to the education of the people?" No such profession has ever been made by voluntary educationists, whose design has rather been to help the people to educate themselves. By the language he employs, however, Dr. M'Kerrow seems to refer to the benevolent zeal of the Dissenters alone, for he speaks of the efforts of "religious voluntaryism." Now the "religious voluntaries," or the Dissenters, have never made any approach to so presumptuous a position as to deem themselves either charged with the education of the working classes, or capable of effecting it. Educational voluntaryism spreads itself through all ecclesiastical bodies, being in none more splendid than in the Church of England itself, and is quite a different thing from "religious voluntaryism," with which Dr. M'Kerrow has palpably confounded it. If I assert that the voluntary principle is adequate to the educational wants of the community, I assert it in this sense, that, with such judicious and temporary aid as may be drawn from voluntary sources, the people, even to the poorest classes short of actual pauperism, will educate themselves. This I believe to be true; and as yet no one can prove it to be false.

Fourthly, because the voluntary principle is obviously capable of a great deal more than it has yet done. Nothing like a fair proportion of the wealth and influence of the country has yet been poured into this channel. Let the Dean of Manchester's statement concerning that city (1284) be taken for an example, and others which may be seen in the Inspectors' Reports. The fact is, that while a few individuals are in energetic action, the country at large sleeps on the subject; but it is a sleep from which they are capable of being aroused by proper measures, and from which many would promptly arouse themselves if they knew there was no longer any prospect of a school rate, or of further Government help. It is quite in the power of persons of wealth and station to give a popularity and impulse to this class of contributions, which should put them on a par with hospitals, orphan asylums, and numerous similar institutions, which are even more dependent than schools on benevolent contributions, but which no one thinks of putting on the rates. Let exertions like those by which these institutions are supported be made for schools, and especially let parties who subscribe see to it that their subscriptions are equivalent to a rate of 2*d.* or even 3*d.* in the pound on their property, and there would no longer be any difficulty.—*Appendix*, pp. 239, 241.

We cannot introduce at a better point than the present the following practical suggestions from the pen of the Rev. W. J. Unwin, principal of the Normal school sustained by the Congregational Board of Education of Homerton. They occur in an account of that institution put in evidence by Mr. Hinton, and inserted in the Appendix, p. 250, *seq.*

*The Methods by which the Voluntary Principle in Education may be rendered more Efficient.*

1. The Mode of Remunerating the Teacher.

The teacher is ordinarily remunerated by a fixed salary, the Committee taking the entire responsibility of the school. For this I have proposed to substitute the following arrangement: that the teacher should receive the school fees, and from the Committee a fixed sum, varying according to the circumstances of the locality in which the school is situated; that when a certain amount is thus realized, say £90 or £100, one-third of the surplus should be retained by the teacher, and two-thirds revert to the Committee for the improvement of the school.

The following considerations have induced me to adopt this plan :—

(a.) It supplies the teacher with the same stimulus to exertion which is felt in all other walks of life.

(b.) It brings the teacher into closer relation to the parents, and promotes that mutual co-operation which is essential to success.

(c.) By identifying the interests of the teacher with the prosperity of the school, it secures attention to those minute details of which no superintendence of the Committee, nor any form of inspection can take cognizance, and the disregard of which is the most frequent cause of failure.

To elevate the position of teachers, and to secure for them a better support, are objects of great importance. These can only be reached by subjecting them to some free competition, under which excellence will be assured of its reward. They ought not to be either so controlled by committees, or so supported by societies, as to reduce them to be the recipients of a fixed stipend for the performance of a fixed routine. So long as this system obtains, their vocation will awaken no enthusiasm, and the perfunctory discharge of duty will be but slightly checked. They should have scope for developing personal qualities and plans, and reap the fruit of their earnest devotedness to their profession.

### 2. The Relation of Parents to the School.

The instruction of children is primarily a parental duty. Benevolent efforts have too much overlooked this. In arrangements to promote the education of the people, the duty of the parent should be made most prominent. Hence it is not only desirable that the teacher should be placed in a position which will necessitate his enlisting the sympathy and co-operation of parents, but parents should be led to see that no wish is entertained to take out of their hands the most sacred of all duties. I have therefore recommended that measures should be adopted to induce parents to associate themselves with the Committee in the management and superintendence of the school. This plan was, on my recommendation, adopted at Witham, Essex, to which a teacher was sent August 1849. At a meeting of parents they were invited to elect five of their number to act with the Committee. The school, which was then in a very depressed state, and carried on at a large cost, has, since this period, greatly improved, the parents have been greatly interested, and the institution is no longer burdensome to its supporters, whilst the teacher realises a larger salary than his predecessors received.

For two interesting letters here inserted we refer our readers to the Blue book.

### 3. The Purchase of Books by the Children.

This plan has been strongly urged as alike practicable and desirable. Where it is carried out, the annual expenditure of the school is diminished; facilities are afforded for home exercises, by which the education of the school is greatly improved, and the interest of parents in the progress of their children is excited. The teacher must be prepared to take some trouble in carrying out this object, but the advantages he will reap will prove an ample recompense.

### 4. The Union in the School of different Classes.

This is a distinguishing feature in the King's Somborne School, where the child of the labourer, the farmer, and the medical practitioner mingle without distinction. Such an arrangement may not be everywhere practicable; but a superior education will attract children of parents whose position in society varies considerably; and in any new effort, if care is taken to secure the children of parents in better circumstances, the poorer will generally make a strenuous effort for advantages which are held in such estimation.

### 5. The Character of the Education imparted.

1. The instruction imparted should be practical; closely related to the future prospects of the child. There are certain things which even the most imperfectly educated appreciate, and if the co-operation of parents is to be

sought, if they are expected to make sacrifices for the education of their children, their views must be met. Hence my advice to a teacher is—satisfy the notion parents have as to what is necessary, and thus gain their confidence, and then add as much as it may be in your power to supply.

2. The teacher himself should impart as large an amount of instruction as circumstances admit. The method by which a teacher had simply to control a certain mechanical arrangement, devolving on a subordinate and ill-qualified agency the communication of knowledge, is thoroughly repudiated by the common sense of the people.

### 6. Higher Payments.

That there exists amongst the poor a strong desire for the education of their children, and that they are willing to pay a higher price for an article of greater value, is a fact verified by abundant evidence. In a large number of schools of long standing, to which our teachers have been sent, the fees have been raised, and in each the attendance has increased. In the new schools a higher scale of charges than is usual has been adopted, and it is believed that as many have availed themselves of the advantages offered as would have done so had the fees been lower.

### 7. Schools for the Education of Boys and Girls together.

The education of boys and girls together has been advocated as involving important educational advantages. Of late years, notwithstanding the force of considerable prejudice, the practice has been extensively adopted. In meeting the difficulties of thinly populated districts this plan is of great value, enabling the friends of education to establish one efficient school, where two could scarcely be sustained. In connexion with this arrangement, it is found that a thoroughly qualified mistress may be employed with great advantage, securing an education of a higher order than has been ordinarily accessible, while the cost is comparatively trifling.

To these suggestions Mr. Unwin adds a tabular statement, showing in a very gratifying manner the beneficial operation of them through several years ; but for this also want of room compels us to refer to the Blue book.

The evidence given by Drs. Watts and M'Kerrow against the Voluntary system consists almost entirely in the allegation that it is not adequate to the educational wants of the community. Thus Dr. M'Kerrow.

334. *Chairman.*—What are the objections that you have to the voluntary efforts of the religious denominations which are endeavouring to increase the amount of education in the country?—Voluntaryism is entirely free from the objections which have been advanced against the system pursued under the Minutes of Council. But I consider it to be inadequate to meet the educational necessities of the community. I admit that great efforts have been made of late to increase the means and to improve the quality of education to the children of the working and poorer classes, and voluntaryism points to the progress which has been made in this respect as an evidence of its power speedily to overtake the want of day-school instruction which confessedly still exists. I am disinclined, however, to admit the validity of the argument founded on such progress, and the efficiency of voluntaryism to supply the requisite means of day-school instruction, for the following reasons: first, it is not to pure voluntaryism that the country is indebted for the progress which has been made ; . . . . and I am satisfied that it would have contributed and accomplished much less than it has done if it had not been stimulated in very many cases by the prospect of receiving from Government grants of the public money. Secondly, the efforts which have been made by voluntaryism in Manchester and Salford have, in a great measure, been abortive. Thirdly, I cannot admit the efficiency of the voluntary principle, because the congregations in Manchester which contend for its exclusive operation, do little to convince the public of its disposition or capability to extend education. . . . Fourthly, the

voluntary schools cannot compete successfully with those which are aided by Government; the teachers have not equal encouragement, and have not the advantage derived from the assistance of pupil teachers. . . . There is a fifth and last circumstance which indisposes me to commit education to mere voluntaryism, and that is, the want of funds to prosecute its objects.

To these Dr. M'Kerrow afterwards adds three other reasons.

The first is, that a large number of the denominational schools have not extended education much among the poor, but have merely broken up the schools of the private teachers and cheapened instruction to the middle classes, who need no charitable assistance. The second is, that as almost all the churches and chapels, whose position or circumstances might be expected to induce them to establish day schools, have done so already, and as we have scarcely an instance of a church or a chapel, purely for the sake of education, establishing a second school, but little hope can be entertained that the denominations will do much more for day-school instruction than they have done already. And the third is, notwithstanding all the educational efforts which have been put forth by the different sects and parties of the country, and all the sums of money obtained by voluntary contributions, and by grants from Government for educational purposes, attendance on day-school instruction has not kept pace with the increase of the population in Manchester and Salford.

Whatever may be the force of these reasons—and there are some of them which have considerable weight, especially that which is drawn from the inactivity of the Voluntary educationists at Manchester—we submit that they are all of them beside the mark. The question, which was no doubt framed to suit the answer, is in these terms:—"What are the objections that you have to the voluntary efforts of *the religious denominations*?" And Dr. M'Kerrow gravely tells us that he does not think *these* "adequate to meet the educational necessities of the community." Simple man! why, who ever did so? The notion is too absurd, aad the only thing more whimsical than holding it is the frolic of thus gravely refuting it. At a subsequent period the following answer was given by Dr. M'Kerrow to a question put by Mr. Peto.

379. *Mr. Peto.*—Why should voluntaryism be expected to be adequate to the education of the people; did it ever profess to do so, or to undertake it?—It apparently professes to be able to undertake it, because I understand that the great objection to the national system is made by those people who are voluntaries, and who say, "We must leave the people alone, and just pursue the system of voluntaryism." Now one reason why I am disposed to argue for a national system is, that as I consider that voluntaryism is not able to undertake the education of the people, it ought not to profess to do it; I think that religious voluntaryism should concern itself entirely with religious things, and that voluntaryism ought no more to undertake the education of the people than it ought to undertake the paving and lighting of the streets.

Here again Dr. M'Kerrow distinctly refers to "religious voluntaryism," or in simpler phrase, voluntary religionists, that is, to a portion of the English nonconformists; and he says that they "apparently profess to undertake the education of the whole people," because he understands that "the great objection to the [a] national system" is made by them. Now we must say that we think this is a *non sequitur*. There is clearly no identity—there is even no visible connexion, between objecting to a national system of education and undertaking to educate the whole people oneself. It is quite possible—we believe it is actually the fact—that those who most vehemently object to state-education maintain with almost equal energy that the people should educate themselves.

Dr. M'Kerrow, however, has some objections to offer to the educational action of religious bodies to any extent, however limited.

332. *Chairman.*—Have you any objections of a more special nature to make against the existing day-school agencies than those you have stated?—I wish to be permitted to make some remarks on the denominational agencies which have to a large extent superseded all others. While it must be granted, that the denominations have a right to do whatever kind of good they please, I cannot but think that it is not the province of religious associations to interfere with secular teaching. They may just as well establish medical dispensaries or bread shops as schools for reading, writing, and arithmetic, in connexion with their places of worship. Secular things ought, in my opinion, to be prosecuted by us in our relation to society as subjects or citizens, and religious things in our capacity of members of churches or congregations. If secular objects be undertaken by Christian communities as such, there must be a diminution of the means of extending religious knowledge and influence, which it is the special province of such communities to diffuse. But I have also another general objection to these denominational agencies, which is, that they are virtually enforcing a religious instruction on the people. They have destroyed to a large extent in Manchester the private schools, and in many quarters education can only be obtained in those schools where the secular and the religious are blended in the lessons given. And hence, those who are opposed to Christianity, those who do not wish that the schoolmaster should meddle with doctrinal subjects, or the religious instruction of their children, and those who have not in the locality in which they reside any denominational school harmonizing with the sentiments they entertain, if they would have their children instructed at all, must send them where opinions which they do not agree with are inculcated. Doubtless, in some cases, if the parents objected to doctrinal instruction, the child might be allowed to withdraw from it, but such a removal commonly brands with a distinctive mark, which it is by no means agreeable to parent or child to receive, and is applicable only where religious instruction is associated with a separate hour and lesson. But if the lesson may be given in this way, it might be communicated to all who are willing to receive it at some other time than that which is considered to be the usual period of secular instruction in the school. Those more especially who advocate the rights of conscience, and the voluntary principle in religion, would thus free themselves from the charge of attempting to force religious opinions on the community by means of the absorbing character of denominational schools.

In relation to this somewhat eager assault we cannot do better than cite Mr. Hinton's reply.

Dr. M'Kerrow made some rather severe remarks on the denominational mode of educational effort adopted by some (but only by some) nonconformist bodies. "While it must be granted," said the reverend gentleman, "that the denominations have a right to do whatever good they please, I cannot but think that it is not the province of religious associations to interfere with secular teaching. They may just as well establish medical dispensaries or bread shops, as schools for reading, writing, and arithmetic, in connexion with their places of worship" (332). Without objecting very strongly to the principle here laid down, I think the Doctor's own illustration will go far towards justifying denominational school efforts; for were "medical dispensaries and bread shops" as rare and as difficult to be provided as schools for the working classes once were, there is not a church or chapel in England but would have been commended for annexing one of each to its vestry.

Other objections which have been adduced to denominational schools appear to me of little force. Dr. M'Kerrow alleged that they "virtually enforce religious instruction," (332). They do nothing more, however, than bring an education of a definite and well-known kind into the market, and take such a stand as the quality and acceptableness of the article may acquire for them. If any party would establish better or more acceptable schools, these would

soon be beaten out of the field ; and even if there were anything in their character to regret (of which, in my opinion, there is not very much) this would be the only fair way of remedying the evil. When it is insinuated that denominational schools are nurseries of bigotry and uncharitableness, injustice is done them. Generally speaking, nonconformist schools are conducted in an eminently catholic spirit, tenacious indeed of the great doctrines of Christianity, but paying little regard to sentiments by which evangelical communions are distinguished from one another.—*Appendix*, p. 244.

Mr Hinton goes on to say—

I am not, however, in favour of denominational schools, of which it is plain there never can be any general system. I should suppose, indeed, that a general system of denominational schools has never been thought of by any person ; nor do I look to the perpetuation and extension of denominational school effort. I do not wish popular education to be (as Sir Kay Shuttleworth phrases it) "in the hands of the religious communions." On the contrary, what I wish to see is the self-education of the working classes, or parents everywhere attending to the education of their own children ; and under such circumstances I should be most happy to witness the dissolution of all the educational societies which religious communions have formed, and which, for the time, have been of such great advantage.

I have only to add on this subject a short but very interesting extract from the Report of the Rev. J. D. Morell, school inspector, for 1850, in relation to a germ of educational action of a general kind, and of great promise. "There is gradually developing," says Mr. Morell, "in the midst of the merchant and manufacturing interests, as well as amongst the working classes themselves, a deep and honest interest in the educational problem of the country, which must ere long claim an equal attention and respect with the efforts of religious communities. I have on various occasions been invited to inspect educational institutions far more complete than any upon my present list of schools, which have arisen from the efforts of the people (aided and abetted by their employers) to elevate themselves in the scale of intelligence, These efforts are assuredly the commencement of an educational movement which is destined to play no inconsiderable part in the future."—Minutes, 1851, v. ii., p. 620. *Appendix*, pp. 244, 245.

Dr. Watts's opinion of educational voluntaryism is given in the following terms.

551. *Chairman.*—Do you consider voluntary effort to be insufficient ?—I wish to present some reasons to show that voluntary effort is in its nature inefficient for education. The educational want is constant, regular, progressive with the population, while voluntary help is inconstant, irregular, and generally retrogressive from the beginning. Men's duties are in accordance with their means, whilst voluntary effort is according to inclination, or almost anything but the means of the giver. The case is frequent where a good man dies, or fails in business, or is offended because his neighbours do not second him, and the school struggles in difficulty or goes out in consequence ; the need for that school being as great as ever. Another objection to the nature of voluntaryism is, that it tends to inequality in distribution. If a man gives he gives in his own vicinity ; and we have respectable and poor neighbourhoods, and they do not always so closely approach each other as to spread help equally. Thus, the result of voluntaryism is to make a few bright spots, leaving all else dark. And voluntaryism fails principally when most needed, that is in times of bad trade, when the troubles of the poor being increased, temptation to wrong is also increased, and their children require the most unremitting care ; but then it is that the school wage being deficient, the school-door is shut, and the children are in the streets.

At the conclusion of this answer the following question was well put.

552. *Mr. Bowyer.*—What do you mean exactly by voluntary effort ? Do you

mean temporary subscriptions as distinguished from endowments?—I mean temporary subscriptions as distinguished from endowments; but I include under the head of voluntary effort the payment of fees by parents.

Very right, Dr. Watts; by all means the payment of school fees by parents should be included under the head of voluntary educational effort; only now be pleased to observe, that the objections you have urged apply exclusively to the subscriptions and not to the weekly pence—not to educational voluntary effort as a whole, therefore, but only to a part of it, and that an incidental rather than an essential part, one of temporary requirement, it may be hoped, and in time to be dispensed with altogether.

That the inconveniences described by Dr. Watts do, to some extent, attach to the subscription system is doubtless true, but several reasons may be assigned why comparatively little should be thought of them. It may be observed generally, that in every method of aiding the educational efforts of the people there are inconveniences of some kind, it is an infelicity from which no one is exempt. If the subscription system is subject to one class of them, certainly the Government grant and the taxation system are subject to other classes of them. The fact of there being inconveniences therefore, amounts to nothing, for this may be said of all methods; the wise course is to adopt the plan of which the inconveniences are the fewest and the smallest, or (better still) the plan which is the soundest in principle, contending manfully with whatever inconveniences may be attached to the right. On either and both of these grounds we are prepared to challenge comparison for the subscription system. As an auxiliary to parental effort, we are convinced that it is in principle the soundest which can be devised, and consequently the best, even though its inconveniences were the greatest; a ground on which we would give it instant preference, without asking another question. If, however, a further question must be asked, and the inconveniences of the respective systems be balanced, we are equally well convinced that, on this ground also, the subscription system claims to be preferred.

The chief practical inconvenience attaching to the subscription system hitherto has been the very small extent to which it has been carried out. In relation to this point the following question was put to Mr. Hinton by Sir George Grey.

1623. *Sir G. Grey.*—What stimulus is likely to be applied to voluntary agency to make it more effective for the future than it has been up to the present time in providing education?

Mr. Hinton's answer to this question is as follows.

First, I think the amount of exertion now made, and the rate at which education has been advancing, warrant the expectation of accelerated progress. Secondly, the settlement of the educational controversy, if that could happily be arrived at, would set at liberty a large amount of energy for direct and more profitable employment. Thirdly, were but voluntary effort, in its widest range, established as the rule, a far more general and hearty co-operation might be expected from all classes; at present, isolation of effort and expectation of change paralyse exertion. Fourthly, the correction of the mistakes to which I have referred in my answer 1667, and the employment of the new methods indicated, would ensure for exertion an augmented success. It is the lot of man to commit mistakes, and it is in the order of God's providence to make our mistakes conducive to their own correction by the inconveniences which they occasion. To adopt a course of reform would clearly be much more rational than petulantly to abandon a system of unquestionable healthiness,

and of unknown energy, in consequence of our own blunders; and this is more especially true in a case in which the voluntary principle has not only been so largely developed in fact, but so studiously fostered by Parliament and the Government themselves.—*Appendix*, p. 241.

The third topic in this paragraph suggests an answer to an objection brought forward by the chairman, and clung to by him with evident tenacity. Thus in the examination of Dr. M'Kerrow.

382. *Chairman.*—In poor districts, where persons of property are not residing, and where schools will be as much wanted as elsewhere, or perhaps more, the difficulty would be the greatest in getting subscriptions?—Most certainly.

And afterwards in the examination of Mr. Kennedy.

1344. *Chairman.*—Can a system of education which is based, first of all, upon voluntary subscriptions of persons of property, meet the case of those districts inhabited principally by poor persons, in which there may not be resident persons of property willing to subscribe?—I do not think that a mere voluntary system is sufficient.

In reply to the objection thus adduced, it would be easy to say that the cases alleged are not the rule but the exception, and that consequently they are not entitled to determine the rule of conduct, but should be provided for in an exceptional manner. It might be said, moreover, that we are no advocates for "a system of education which is *based first of all* upon voluntary subscriptions of persons of property;" we plead for a system based on the voluntary action of parents. They may, in particular localities, not only want help, but more help than the locality can supply; and we say, let them have it. In the words of Mr. Hinton, "Were but voluntary effort in its widest range established as the rule, a far more general and hearty co-operation might be expected from all classes."

---

## CHAPTER III.

### THE SECULAR SYSTEM—ITS SCOPE.

The leading advocates of the Secular system have organized themselves under the style and title of the National Public School Association; it seems, therefore, that, in seeking to obtain for their scheme legislative sanction, they propose to provide by law for the establishment of "Public" schools—that is, of schools for all who should choose to take advantage of them, and, of course, adapted to the utmost wants of at least the working classes. A complete system of first-rate free schools supported by taxation is accordingly contemplated, from the infant to the industrial, with normal institutions for the training of masters; and if, after the establishment of these, any other schools remain unabsorbed, they also, on transforming themselves into secular free schools, may be put upon the rates. This is the anticipated consummation which would render their scheme truly "national." Thus Dr. Watts.

653. *The Marquis of Blandford.*—Do you intend this national system as a universal system?—We intend it to be made capable of universalizing itself.

Our proposition is to make a beginning, and to give it the power of expansion, so that it may become national.

Now we pause at the outset to ask, Why so vast a field of operations should be sketched out? To us it is palpable that it very much exceeds the necessity proved, or even alleged. Some are not educated, say these philanthropists; therefore provide by law, and at the public expense, for the education of all. There is a clear *non sequitur* in this argument. Nothing can fairly be deduced from the premises (which, of course, we do not deny) beyond this, that provision should be made for the instruction of the destitute and neglected classes.

To this point, indeed, Dr. Watts, in his correspondence with Mr. Hinton in the columns of the *Daily News*, has distinctly come. Admitting the primary character of parental educational obligation, he says—"But the duty not being performed, and education being necessary to society, it becomes necessary for society to provide for the deficiency. And he subsequently adds, "I believe every member of the National Public School Association would be satisfied with a law empowering local Committees to set up schools for the neglected."* Will the National Public School Association adopt this declaration of their recognized agent, and reduce their plans to a conformity with it?

We may further observe that in his letters in the *Daily News* Dr. Watts treats the expansion of such a system, not as a thing intended, but as a thing accidental merely, and as arising from the crowding into the free schools of children whose parents are educating them now at their own cost. "I am quite aware," says he, "of the difficulty which would be created by the niggardly portion of the population who can afford to pay sending their children to the free schools."* In his evidence, however, he takes a different view. He says—

558. My impression is that there must be a legislative enactment to set up schools for the neglected, and that it is possible, and therefore ought to be contemplated, that existing schools may under such enactment become free schools. Any plan, therefore, should be so prepared as to admit of this expansion; connected with a positive provision for the neglected, it should have powers of expansion to the national.

Here an expansion of the free schools for the neglected into a national, that is, a universal system, extending even to the absorption of existing schools, is spoken of as a thing contemplated and prepared for from the beginning; but for what reason does not appear. An attempt is made at argument, indeed, but of the feeblest kind. "It is possible," says Dr. Watts, "and *therefore* ought to be contemplated." Admirable logic! As if all things that are "possible" "ought *therefore* to be contemplated!"

On the point now before us, Mr. Curtis, one of the Manchester schoolmasters brought up to give evidence before the Committee on the 6th of May, when there was no quorum, in a letter inserted in the Appendix, expresses an opinion diametrically opposite to that of Dr. Watts. Speaking of the neglected and destitute children, he says—

Whilst fully concurring in the opinion that the community is bound to make provision for the education of children thus neglected and destitute, I may be allowed to express my conviction, which I know coincides with the views of a large proportion of the schoolmasters here, that a separate class of schools

* Daily News, Nov. 2, 1853. † Daily News, Oct. 24, 1853.

should be established for such children. These might be entirely free, but altogether distinct from those already in existence, serving to draw more definitely the line of demarcation between the industrious and economical, and the idle and improvident.—*Appendix*, p. 265.

Dr. M'Kerrow has avoided the inconsistencies in which Dr. Watts has entangled himself, and has taken wider grouud. At the close of his answer to Q. 344 this gentleman lays it down as "the right and duty of the legislature to supply the wants of the destitute, *and to promote the welfare of the community.*" The latter phrase is of large, we might say of almost boundless extent, and, if allowed, would justify, not only any conceivable measures on the subject of education, but any conceivable measures of any other kind, secular or religious, deemed by the Government to be for "the welfare of the community," So loose and unprincipled is the wisdom tendered by earnest and zealous philanthropists for the guidance of the British legislature! We fix Dr. M'Kerrow, however, to the ground which he himself has selected. "If," says he, "the parents cannot or will not give necessary food to the body of the child, no one will assert that he must be left to die of hunger, but all will admit that he should receive parish relief. I argue, that mental food should be given in like manner when circumstances so require" (326). To this we agree; and Dr. M'Kerrow, by his own showing, can ask no more. The Doctor and his friends ought in common honesty to restrict themselves to schools for destitute and neglected children.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS TEACHING.

From the scope which it is proposed by the National Public School Association to occupy, we pass to the instruction which it is proposed to give. This is set forth by Dr. M'Kerrow in the following terms.

336. *Chairman.*—Now with regard to the National Public School Association, their object is secular instruction; will you explain what you mean by secular instruction?—It has been difficult to find a word or phrase by which to explain clearly and accurately the nature of the system of instruction sought by the members of the National Public School Association to be established in the country. The term "secular" has been chosen as seemingly best fitted to denote those kinds of knowledge, such as reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography, which are supposed to be necessary to the management of the intelligent intercourse of life, in contradistinction to those theological or religious opinions about which sects and denominations differ. It does not oppose, but simply does not embrace any kind of theological or religious belief. It does not interfere with matters of faith, but it includes the teaching of those practical precepts of morality upon which the constitution of society in this country is based; those virtues of reverence to the Divine Being, of truth, justice, kindness, forbearance, temperance, frugality, and such like, about the propriety and necessity of which society is agreed. It does not, however, comprehend the inculcation of the different motives with which religious denominations endeavour to enforce the observance of those virtues or moralities.

A generally similar account is subsequently given by Dr. Watts.

572. I wish to refer now to what national education ought to and might cc: ,rise. The form of Bill proposed by the National Public School Asso-

ciation, which I have handed in, prescribes within its day-school instruction the following subjects: reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, geography, history; the various qualities and uses of objects, which must necessarily include geology, mineralogy, chemistry, natural history under its various forms, physiology, mechanics, hydrostatics, and pneumatics. And then we have the doctrines of morality, in which are involved social economy, or as stated in the Bill, truth, justice, kindness, forbearance, temperance, industry, frugality, and all other virtues conducive to the right ordering of practical conduct in the affairs of life.

The difficulty which Dr. M'Kerrow found in "explaining clearly the nature of the system of instruction sought by the members of the National Public School Association to be established in the country," was evidently found also by the members of the Committee in their attempts to understand it. A subsequent part of Dr. M'Kerrow's evidence afforded the following aid to their endeavours.

493. I do not mean to say that we could in the public schools assign to children special motives why they should avoid a particular evil, or perform a particular virtue. I imagine that the motive would be furnished elsewhere, and all that we have to do is simply to reprove the sin, or to teach the duty.

Even this, however, left them in doubt, and further inquiries elicited at length from Dr. M'Kerrow the following appalling statements.

494. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—Does it not amount to this, that instruction would go on five days in the week, and that education properly so called, that is, the bringing up of the whole man, and applying those motives which will induce him to act properly, would take place only on the Saturday or the Sunday?—Moral lessons might be given in the school during the regular school hours, but distinctive opinions would not be taught in those school hours day by day.

495. Is what you state this, that no Christian motive to action, and no Christian principles, should be inculcated in secular schools?—I think not.

496. No motive arising from the peculiar doctrines of Christianity?—Most certainly no motive arising from the peculiar doctrines of Christianity; but different opinions are formed of what are the true and peculiar doctrines of Christianity. I mean to say we could not introduce into the public schools, motives derived from the atonement of Christ, or that class of motives. You can introduce motives arising from the authority of God, and future responsibility, and that class of motives.

Dr. Watts, without being so explicit as Dr. M'Kerrow, brings us to the same point. Having stated that the secular instruction to be given would comprehend so much of religion as was "common to all sects," he was thus interrogated.

610. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Could you give us any idea of what you mean by 'common to all sects?'

*Ans.*—I think I could. . . The common term under which it is included is the moral precepts of Christianity, and it would include the moral providence of God.

And at a later period thus.

829. *Mr. Brotherton.*—Supposing the schoolmaster to say to a child, it was his duty to love God above all things, and his neighbour as himself; would you call that teaching religion, or morality . . . ?—I should call that teaching so much of religion as all sects are agreed upon.

830. Then you would have no objection to those parts of Scripture being taught?—None whatever.

831. It is only where they depart from Scriptures that you object?—Only when they begin to inculcate peculiar doctrines; then it is that I object.

833. You would not object to the teaching of religion so far as it is founded on the Sacred Scriptures ?—So far as all sects are agreed. Whenever the sects disagree I object.

834. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Would you extend the word "sects" so far as to exclude Jews, who are not a Christian sect ?—In using the term "sect," I do not wish it to be understood as "Christian sect;" but as including all the different religions we have in this country.

The reader will please to observe how carefully Dr. Watts eschews the idea to which Mr. Brotherton would have led him, that he "would not object to the teaching of religion so far as it was founded on the sacred scriptures." Not so fast, Mr. Brotherton! Dr. Watts tells you that "whenever the sects disagree" he objects; and he includes not only "Christian sects," but "all the different religions we have [or may have] in this country."

We may now avail ourselves of a further portion of Mr. Hinton's evidence.

1493. *Chairman.*—What is the nature of the evidence you wish to offer respecting the secular Bill ?—I shall confine myself to those parts of it which relate to the instruction to be given.

1494. In what clause ?—In the 14th clause. "The children shall be instructed in reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, geography, and history, the various qualities and uses of the objects by which they are surrounded, and generally in such kinds of useful knowledge, together with industrial training, as may be deemed advisable, or the growing intelligence of the people may demand; and in addition to these, shall be sedulously inculcated a strict regard to truth, justice, kindness, and forbearance in their intercourse with their fellow-creatures, temperance, industry, frugality, and all other virtues conducive to the right ordering of practical conduct in the affairs of life."* I will consider the scheme of instruction thus sketched out in two lights; first, as supposed to constitute the whole of education; and secondly, as supposed to be supplemented by a machinery for religious instruction. As to the first, I wish to state distinctly that, although I fully believe in the possibility of over-education, I offer no objection to the teaching of any of the things that are here enumerated, nor to the adding to this list of any other branches of secular knowledge, even to the extent to which this is carried in the Birkbeck schools, by attending which I observe it stated that even Members of Parliament might profit.

1495. What then is the nature of your objection ?—My objection is, that the language used has a negative and exclusive force; the meaning being that religious instruction is not to be given in the schools. According to the title of the Bill, the schools are to be used for "secular instruction."

1496. Will you state particularly your objection to this provision ?—My objection is, that it attempts a distinction which is impossible; one, namely, fundamental to the scheme itself, between secular and religious instruction. There are many proofs that the promoters of the scheme have never been able to make this distinction clear to their own minds; and what cannot be made clear in thought can never be consistently carried out in practice. The leading gentlemen who have written on the subject have taken at least three different views; and at a public meeting held at Manchester, 1st December, 1851, at which Mr. George Combe advocated a fourth, an eminent person (Mr. Cobden) is reported to have stated that he and his friends were not yet arrived at a period of the discussion at which it could be agreed what secular instruction was.

* The reader will observe generally, that neither Dr. Watts nor Dr. M'Kerrow quoted the words of the bill; and particularly, that the bill makes no mention of "the virtue of reverence to the Divine being" insisted on by the latter gentleman.

1513. *Mr. Brotherton.*—What is your opinion of the distinction?—I do not think that a clear distinction can be drawn between secular and religious instruction for the purpose of school instruction. You do not, for example, omit saying something about God; that has been * admitted; and that is religious. You cannot separate instruction absolutely from religious ideas.

1514. You think what God has joined, man should not put asunder?—I think so.

The Chairman here attempted an illustration of the difference between secular and religious instruction.

1515. *Chairman.*—Would you say that spelling can be taught separately from religious instruction?—No doubt of it.

1516. Writing?—No doubt of it.

1517. Can arithmetic?—No doubt of it.

1518. Can geography?—Clearly.

1519. Can needlework?—Clearly.

1520. Are not all those things useful and necessary?—Undoubtedly.

1521. Would it be desirable to give those if you gave nothing else?—Clearly.

Questions similar to these were afterwards put to Mr. Toole, and the proper answer to them was then brought out by Mr. Bowyer.

1186. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do not you distinguish between certain specific† studies, such instruction as reading, writing, and arithmetic, and what is called education?—As a part of the education, of course.

1187. A man may learn arithmetic, and he might read and write, without learning religion at the same time?—It does not follow, any further than that arithmetic being exceedingly true, and God being true, they must be dependent one upon the other; I do not see any other connexion between them.

1188. But when they go beyond reading, writing, and arithmetic, they go to what is called education; then do you not think that religion becomes a necessary part of it?—Yes, certainly.

Mr. Hinton's examination was thus continued.

1505. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Is not the distinction between secular and religious practically known in the distribution of the grant referred to in the Minutes of Council by inspectors when they visit schools, and in short, although the metaphysical definition may not be forthcoming, practically very well understood?—No inquiry whatever is made with respect to religion as to the grants from the Privy Council, I understand.

1506. An inspector of Roman-catholic schools is instructed and does report on their secular teaching, and not on their religious; there the distinction is drawn, is it not, as in many other cases?—Yes, it is carried out by the opinion of individuals; no two individuals would do the same thing on it.

1507. My question only goes to this, whether a distinction so recognised and acted on, may not be assumed without the necessity of a definition?—I think for this Bill it should be made in a definite form.

The examination then turned on the distinction drawn in the body of the bill.

1497. A distinction is drawn in the Bill?—In the Bill this distinction [between secular and religious instruction] is quietly thrown overboard, and another is substituted for it, namely, that which may be drawn between secular instruction and "doctrinal religion," or "sectarian opinions." Now, if these qualifying epithets mean anything at all, they essentially alter the scheme by allowing such religious instruction as is not doctrinal or sectarian, and they forbid its being any longer called secular; it is henceforth mixed, secular and religious.

1498. The epithets employed, of course, mean something?—Of course they

* Misprinted *was*.

† Misprinted *religious studies*.

mean something; but then they require definition, without which they may at various times be taken to mean so much more or less, that they may come practically to mean anything or nothing, as the party using them pleases. Now, I affirm, that a definition of them is impossible for the purposes of this Bill.

1525. Where does the difficulty lie of defining this distinction?—The difficulty lies here. No doctrinal religion, we are told, is to be inculcated; but the being and attributes of God, his creation, providence, and moral government, are doctrines of religion. Now, taking the letter of the Bill, these are not to be taught in the schools, in which case they become atheistic, and on this ground intolerable; or if they are to be taught, because, in the words of the Bill, no "sect of Christians" objects to these, then a principle is introduced which requires it to be specified what the various sects of Christians do and do not object to. The only help afforded by the Bill is in these words; it forbids "the inculcation of things in support of, or in opposition to, the peculiar tenets of any sect of Christians." Sects of Christians are so numerous and so diverse that it would need at least one volume, and perhaps several, to exhibit such a classification of religious notions; and in order to conduct education upon such a plan, every schoolmaster must certainly attain a high standing among dialectic divines.* Such a school system is impossible. Dr. Watts himself admits this impossibility in theory, but says there is no difficulty in practice.† To me it seems ‡ that the only course by which the difficulty could be practically solved, would be the ignoring of religion altogether.

1526. This position has been taken by the witnesses examined?—It has; and it is open to several remarks besides that which I have already made. First, it stultifies the designation of the Bill, and converts the title of it into a deceptive and unwarrantable misnomer. It is clearly not a Bill relating to secular schools at all, but for schools which may and will have as much religion as the disagreement of sects will allow. Secondly, it will give great and fatal offence to some of the most zealous supporters of the scheme out of doors. Mr. Baines (1907) § quoted the language of one of the promoters of the secular scheme at a public meeting to the following effect: "A large portion of the community could only join them on the distinct understanding that the teaching was to be nothing more than secular, and that was what the association meant and nothing more. Then why should they impose upon anybody by making it be believed that they intended to give some portion of religious instruction?" Thirdly, nor are those who take it consistent with themselves. Dr. M'Kerrow distinctly says (336) that the secular system "does not embrace any kind of theological or religious belief." This, it appears to me, is a con-

* The following is from Dr. Watts's examination.

593. *Mr. Bowyer.*—How can you determine how much religion is common to all?—I am not quite sure that I can draw the exact line, but if I had time to consider the subject, I think I should not err very much. In looking over the doctrines of the different sects, it would be quite possible to run them out in parallel lines, and to get at pretty nearly the exact measure of how much might be taught without giving offence to conscience.

594. How many sects do you think there are?—According to "Evans's Sketch of all Religions," I think I remember somewhere about 150 in England.

595. Do you think you could define exactly what the doctrines of each of those are?—Yes, with the help of their own publications.

596. Would you not find considerable difference in each sect as to what their doctrines were?—Yes, if they were to be examined individually; but the doctrines of the sects as stated and by them publicly approved would be very easily got at.

597. Are there some sects which profess to have no strict standard?—Only one that I am aware of.

A clever schoolmaster, we think, to carry in his head all these distinctions, as a carpenter carries his rule in his pocket. We do not see where Dr. Watts gets his warrant, however, for disregarding the shades of opinion among individuals.

† *Q.* 897, *seq.*

‡ Misprinted *means.*

§ Report of 1852.

tradiction in terms of the Bill itself, and of his own language elsewhere.* Fourthly, if the position were possible, it would be unjust. The Bill proposes to exclude from scholastic instruction whatever may be "in support of, or in opposition to, the peculiar tenets of any sect of Christians." Now, not all are Christians. Some are Jews, and their ears may be insulted by the name of Christ; some are Deists, some Pantheists, some Atheists, all of whom may be indoctrinated into the attributes of God and future responsibility; and this under a system of professedly secular education. Atheistic silence could be the only equal rule. Fifthly, this position, although taken in this Committee, is not taken by the advocates of secular education out of doors. Public writers, who are the real leaders of public sentiment on the subject, take a widely different view.

Having made this reference, Mr. Hinton handed in a paper containing remarks on various views of Secular Education taken by public writers, which we extract from the Appendix.

I.

The following Extracts are taken from an Article on Secular Education, in the Westminster Review for July, 1852.

"We divide education into two branches: first, Instruction in religious truth, and training to act in conformity with it: secondly, Instruction in the objects and agencies of nature, and in their influence on temporal well-being. The leading aim of Bible religious instruction is to communicate such principles of faith and practice as may insure the salvation and happiness of the individual in the life to come. That of secular instruction is to impart such knowledge and habits of action as may conduce to well-being in the world in which we now live. We propose to disjoin these two branches." p. 17.

"What then should be taught in the schools for the people? The general reform now needed is, to teach, first, things that exist; secondly, their modes of action; thirdly, the nature of man; fourthly, how the elements of nature are adapted to the human mind and body, and how their action gives rise to most of the pleasures and pains of life; and, lastly, in every step of this instruction we should direct the emotional faculties of wonder, reverence, benevolence, conscientiousness, and the love of the beautiful, to God as the author of all, and train these faculties practically to the faith that, in conforming to His laws, we are paying Him the highest homage that can be offered by a rational being to his Creator; and at the same time expanding, elevating, and improving our own minds. Under such a system of instruction and training, the laws of nature, by which health and disease, poverty and riches, honour and disgrace, and every other worldly enjoyment or suffering, are produced, would become the fingerposts and trumpet tongues of Providence, warning the people that 'in this direction lies happiness, in that misery;' and we may hope that, if comprehended to be divine enunciations, and taught and reverenced as such from infancy, they would produce practical effects on conduct, if man be really a rational being. Indeed, until he shall be so instructed and trained, and until he shall thus regulate his conduct, he will never exhibit the true characteristics of a rational creature; and when he has done so for a few generations, he will find himself in a state of civilization and well-being, such as, in his present circumstances, he cannot believe ever to be attainable." p. 14.

On these extracts I make the following remarks:—

In the first place, I cannot admit the alleged and exclusive reference of religious instruction to the happiness of the life to come. The Bible itself declares that godliness has "the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come." 1 Tim. iii. 8. And if it be true that "the leading aim" of the Bible is to prepare for the future, it is also true that it sheds an

* "You can introduce motives arising from the authority of God, and future responsibility," (496).

influence on the present fully proportioned to its comparative importance. Its numerous precepts alone are enough to prove this. In the second place, I cannot admit the efficacy of the instruction proposed to be given to secure mens' present welfare. Secular instruction is here defined to be "instruction in the objects and agencies of nature." "The grand reform now needed," we are assured, "is to teach, first, things that exist; secondly, their modes of action; thirdly the nature of man; fourthly, how the elements of nature are adapted to the human mind and body, and how their action gives rise to most of the pleasures and pains of life; and, lastly, that God is the Author of all, and that in conforming to these His laws, we are paying Him the highest homage that can be offered by a rational being to his Creator." I do not care to lay stress upon the observation that, in speaking of the "highest homage which can be rendered by a creature to its Creator," the writer is going beyond "the objects and agencies of nature," and entering far into the department of doctrinal religion; or, upon the fact that the benefits expected are to be of sorrowfully slow growth, since they are not to be realized until after the lapse of "a few generations." I regard the whole system as incompetent to secure the temporal happiness of mankind, even in a thousand generations. It is an inadequate and false philosophy to say that "the elements of nature give rise to most of the pleasures and pains of life;" since every man's consciousness will tell him that the most important, if not the most numerous of his pleasures and pains, arise from the state and exercises of his own mind, for the right discipline of which this scheme makes no provision; nor is there any provision here for the cultivation of virtue, which is, I conceive, of far greater importance to the happiness both of the individual and of society, than mere material prosperity. Moral sentiments and influences are totally passed by. The entire creed here to be taught is, that the elements of nature and the human frame are in certain ways adapted to each other; that God is the author of these adaptations, and that to observe them is the best homage which can be rendered to Him. Can a virtuous character spring out of such considerations? Even the writer does not pretend this; civilization and advancement are all he ventures to predict from it. Moral obligation, with its grounds, authority, and sanctions; the sense of duty, the primary conceptions of right and wrong, together with the sense of gratitude to God, as not the Creator only, but the constant benefactor of his creatures, and the administrator of a supreme and benign Providence; all these topics are totally ignored: yet these, if I mistake not, are the true seeds of virtue, and virtue is the essential element of happiness, whether present or future.

## II.

### Extracts from the First Annual Report of the Williams Secular School, Edinburgh.

"The promoters of the school desire to leave to the parents themselves, or to such special religious preceptors as they may select, the teaching of doctrines relating to the supernatural world; and it is here that they would draw definitely the line between secular and spiritual instruction." p. 4.

"The object of the school thus includes the training of all the faculties, animal, moral, religious and intellectual; but in order to avoid the difficulties arising from differences of opinion among the various sects on points of religious doctrine, the department of dogmatic spiritual instruction is not undertaken, the teaching being confined to matters that are purely secular, or relating to this world and its duties only." p. 3.

"In the lessons on the physical sciences, they are taught the laws by which the creative intelligence is governing and sustaining the physical universe; in the physiological lessons, they learn the conditions upon which He permits organized beings to enjoy life and health; and in the phrenological lessons, although these cannot teach them what is the essential nature of thought and sentiment, they find an exposition of the organic conditions upon which the manifestations of the intellectual and affective faculties depend; they

learn that the moral as well as the physical world has been created with a fixed and definite constitution, the laws of which we may study, and thereby learn much of the will of the Creator concerning our moral conduct. These laws, as far as the progress of science has yet developed them, are taught by examining the elementary faculties, the action of which produces all our impulses, emotions, and ideas; how these powers may be abused and misdirected, and thus be in discord with each other, and the world without, which discord is vice, and leads to misery; and how they may be rightly used and well directed, so as to be in harmony with each other and all things, which harmony is virtue, and tends to happiness." p. 9.

My remarks on this passage are these:—No such distinction can be carried out as is here drawn between the natural and supernatural world. The idea of God, if I understand it rightly, belongs, not to the natural world, but to the supernatural; and yet it is declared to be the object of the promoters of this school to connect all natural objects with God in the minds of the children, and to impress them with the conviction "that every truth which science teaches is a revelation of God's will." (p. 9.) This, I submit, is very intimately blending the natural and supernatural worlds together. Further, the system of instruction in this school is based upon a theory of man and of morals, not only distinct from Christianity, but hostile to it. It gives "phrenological lessons," and teaches that the action of the elementary faculties produces all our impulses, emotions, and ideas (p. 9), which is materialism. It teaches also that for the human powers "to be in discord with each other and the world without, is vice;" and that for them "to be in harmony with each other and with all things, is virtue;" a theory of virtue by which all moral distinctions are absolutely thrown aside. This theory of man and of morals is essentially anti-scriptural, and stands in irreconcileable opposition to the instruction which will be communicated to the children by any class of religionists taking the Bible as their text book. This is nothing less than systematic infidelity, under the mask of secular instruction.

## III.

To the Report above referred to is appended a paper by the late Dr. Andrew Combe, and extracted from his Life and Correspondence. From this paper I take the following passage:—

"Conscious of the immense power of the religious sentiments in the human mind, and of the impossibility of separating them without violence from their vital union with moralities, I have all along felt that the plan of excluding religion from education was inherently a defective one, which would not continue to hold its place against the assaults of reason and truth. In the past position of the question, it was the best which could be followed, and was defensible as the smallest of several evils among which society was compelled to choose. As such, I still advocate and defend it; but I think it important that it should be defended and advocated on its true grounds, and not as in itself proper and desirable. Instead, therefore, of recommending the separation of secular from religious instruction, as in themselves distinct, I would adopt the true grounds, and in answer to the wish of some to make all education religious, say, 'Yes, I agree with you entirely, that all education must be based on religion, and that the authority of God should be recognized by us all as the only infallible standard in everything; but, that we may know what we are talking about, let us understand distinctly what each of us means by religion.'" p. 1.

Dr. Combe then divides religion into two parts, that concerning which people differ, and that concerning which they agree, and says he will teach the latter. When this residuum is inquired for, it consists, according to him, in scientific knowledge, which, in its very nature "is inherently religious, and tends back to God at every step, and to his will as the rule of our happiness." (p. 10.) Upon this view of the case, I observe, first, that Dr. Combe fairly gives up the principle of a secular or non-religious education, as a plan

which is "inherently defective, and cannot continue to hold its place against the assaults of reason and truth." Secondly, that if the residuary notions in which all persons agree were what he represents them, such an education could not, in any fair sense of the term, be called religious. And, thirdly, that there are absolutely no residuary notions in which all do agree, as he can most satisfactorily learn from his coadjutor Mr. Holyoake, who does not admit that there is any sufficient proof of the existence of a God.

I do not exhibit these differences of opinion among the advocates of secular education in order to condemn them, since it is quite possible that one or other of them may be right, though they cannot all be so; still less do I do it with any feeling of objection to any or all of these modifications of the system being carried out by private parties at their own cost, or by voluntary aid, since, under a system of free action, errors and eccentricities may be expected to neutralize each other; but I do it in order to show that the most earnest and enlightened advocates of the system have not and cannot put it into any definite and consistent shape. It is plain that under the simple and somewhat attractive name of secular education, we should have, not, as the simple might suppose, schools for teaching writing, arithmetic, geography, and needlework; nor, according to Dr. M'Kerrow, schools for teaching everything in religion that is not sectarian; but schools leavened with all sorts of moral and philosophical theories, beginning with the atheistic and ascending to the deistic. Beyond this latter, however, we should never get; for while all such theories have ample licence, Christianity, and Christianity alone, is to be excluded. I cannot but think that such schools would be to a great extent nurseries of irreligion and infidelity; and that they should be made the type of a national system, would, in my opinion, constitute one of the severest blows which could be struck at our national happiness and well-being.

Before passing from these sufficiently conclusive remarks on the nature of the instruction to be given, we must notice a point in which both Dr. Watts and Dr. M'Kerrow are in direct opposition to the bill which they advocate. The bill forbids the inculcation of "things in support of, or in opposition to, the peculiar tenets of any *sect of Christians*." According to this, the instruction to be given should be fundamentally Christian, only not sectarianly Christian; incorporating the great doctrines of the Christian system, and discarding only such as distinguish the various Christian sects from one another; Dr. Watts, however tells us distinctly that, "in using the term sect, he does not wish it to be understood as Christian sect, but as including all the different religious we have in this country," (834); and Dr. M'Kerrow specifically excludes the peculiar doctrines of Christianity," specifying the doctrine of the atonement as one of them (496). It is thus manifest that these prominent advocates of the secular scheme have either not taken the pains to inform themselves fully of its nature, or that their views are out of harmony with it. In either case they render it equivocal service, and they leave us to ask, which are we to believe, the bill or the witnesses—the masters or the journeymen?

To make confusion worse confounded Mr. Binyon, a member of the Society of Friends, is introduced to give evidence on behalf of the secular system. The following is a portion of this gentleman's examination.

1014. *Sir G. Grey.* Do you mean, that you desire yourself that all schools should give, not only strictly secular instruction, but religious instruction, but that you would exclude from schools supported by rates what you term doctrinal religious instruction?—Yes; we would exclude from schools what is called sectarian and doctrinal instruction.

1015. But in the schools belonging to the Society of Friends to which you have referred, and in which you said the children were taught to read the

Bible. and examined upon it, do you make that distinction between moral and doctrinal instruction, or are they examined in the doctrines of the Bible, as well as its facts and precepts ?—I apprehend they would be examined in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, not with a view to sectarian teaching.

1016. But is that the kind of religious instruction, [that] involved in the examination in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, which you wish to see adopted in these schools, termed secular schools, supported by rates ?—I have not, I think, expressed myself as being desirous that the secular schools should be established.

Cautious friend!

1017. *Sir G. Grey.* Did you not state, that you approved of the plan which is before the Committee, for the establishment of what are termed secular schools, understanding that in those schools religious instruction would be given not of a doctrinal kind ?—I said I subscribed under a belief that the Scriptures would not be excluded from those schools ; but I have not expressed any sentiments as to what teaching should take place in those schools.

1018. When you speak of the Scriptures not being excluded, do you mean that their rules would not exclude that kind of religious instruction being given to the sects in those schools, which you have just now described as being given in the schools in connexion with the Society of Friends ?—I have heard that point discussed ; it is a difficult one to answer. I believe one of their rules excludes all doctrinal teaching ; where the line of demarcation as to doctrinal teaching begins and ends would be rather a difficult question to come to ; but I apprehend that some amount of teaching in the fundamental principles of Christianity might, so far as those rules are concerned, be introduced into secular schools.

1019. Is it with that feeling and opinion that you have subscribed to the plan ?—It is.

Hear this, gentlemen!

A little further light on the views of this witness is derivable from the following passage.

1025. *Sir G. Grey.*—Adverting to the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, which the Society of Friends generally support and concur in, are you aware of the nature of the religious instruction given in them ?—I am not aware that there is much religious instruction given in them, excepting so far as those Scriptural lessons give instruction themselves ; and questioning as to the historical parts of Scripture, and the offices of our Saviour, in some degree, I apprehend.

1026. Then do you think that the kind of religious instruction given in the British and Foreign Schools can be given, and should you wish it to be given, in these secular schools, the Bill as to which is before the Committee ?—My apprehension was, that there was sufficient liberty to have done that under their rules.

1027. Might not the schools of the British and Foreign School Society be schools in connexion with this association for the establishment of secular schools ?—I should think so.

So at last we are to understand that the secular schools will allow of instruction in "the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion," and may in all respects be such as those of the British and Foreign School Society! Why all the world knows that, while the reading of the bible in those schools is the only technically expressed condition of the Government grants to them, the cherished habit of those schools is to give, by means of bible lessons, a large amount of unsectarian Christian instruction, and

earnestly to apply all Christian motives as means of moral culture.* Were this to be really the character of the secular schools, with us on this point there would be no further controversy. These statements, however, only show how far simple Mr. Binyon, in common possibly with many other subscribers to the National School Association, had been deceived. The truth is no doubt told us by Dr. Watts and Dr. M'Kerrow. No Christianity! Nothing beyond the being and providence of God! We hope Mr. Binyon and the Society of Friends will undeceive themselves in this matter.

Under a galling sense of the severe but just condemnation which such a scheme of popular education was bringing on itself in the Committee, the advocates of the secular bill brought out in mitigation of sentence this idea, that under one of its clauses the Bible might be used in the schools as a class book. Referring to the factory school of Mr. Bazley, which that gentleman had represented as carried on "upon the secular system," Dr. M'Kerrow is thus interrogated.

436. *Mr. Miles.*—Are you aware at the same time, that the Bible, although not used as a doctrinal book, is used in the school?—It is used in the school precisely in the same way as we propose to introduce the Bible into any of the schools which might be founded in accordance with the principles of the National Public School Association.

437. Then you propose that the Bible should be read in your schools?—We propose to leave that to the school committees; and in those cases in which the people of a district agree to have the Bible read, of course it will be received into the school and used.

We must leave it to our more ingenious readers to say how far this contingency, that a local school Committee *may* direct the introduction of the Bible into a secular school as a school book, bears out Dr. M'Kerrow's assertion—"We propose to introduce the bible into any of the schools which might be founded in accordance with the principles of the National School Association." It is clear to us that the bill proposes no such thing; it merely proposes to give authority to a school Committee to select school books, among which the bible may happen to be, or may not. But let us see what follows. Dr. M'Kerrow is still under examination.

502. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—You have said that the school committee might introduce the reading of the Bible; it is very probable they would introduce the reading of the authorised version?—In some districts there would be a large number of Roman-catholics; and whether it would be the Douay version, we leave that to the school committee to determine.

503. But suppose the school committee introduced in any district the reading of the authorised version where there were Roman-catholics, how would that affect the children of those Roman-catholics?—The Roman-catholic children in all likelihood would object.

504. They would object; but this is a rate supported school, they perhaps having contributed to the rate?—Both versions might be introduced. There would be the authorised version for the children of Protestants, and if the

* In answer to *Q.* 1809, Mr. Salter states, that, according to the method of the British and Foreign School Society, "the teacher is at liberty to teach the doctrines of the Bible in Bible language; he is not at liberty to make comments of his own upon them, but in case of any part being obscure, he is allowed to refer to any other part that will illustrate and make clear what is difficult." This, however, is far from being a correct view of the British and Foreign system. Having applied to the secretary of that institution on the subject, we have been favoured with a copy of the Educational Record for April, 1852, which contains a model lesson of a very different kind.

Roman Catholics objected, the Douay version might be introduced in like manner.

505. Or if the authorised version were still maintained, contrary to their feelings, it might lead to an action in a court of law?—Yes.

506. *Mr. Miles.*—Do you say that in any one of these schools you would have two distinct versions of the Scriptures?—Most distinctly, if the ratepayers wished it. I can fancy a district in which there are a very large number of Roman-catholics. The authorised version is introduced into the school for the sake of the Protestant children; if all are to be treated on the principle of justice, there is no reason why the Douay version should not be introduced in like manner for the Roman-catholic children, therefore we should allow both versions to be introduced.

507. Then it would not be an indiscriminate reading of the two versions; the Protestants would be confined to their own version, and the Roman-catholics to theirs?—Yes.

The edifying prospect so distinctly announced, of the Romish and protestant versions of the Holy Scriptures being thus officially introduced into the same school excited much astonishment in the Committee; and it is certainly a somewhat singular feature, in a scheme which so loudly vaunts its desire to avoid all subjects of religious excitement and controversy.

The introduction of the Bible into secular schools however, simply as a school book—not on a par with even a book of geography or arithmetic, to be used for studying the science of which it treats, but merely, like Gay's or Æsop's fables, for an occasional reading lesson—can have in it no religious value. It is indeed pernicious rather than useful. On this subject Mr. Toole gave the following sensible evidence.

1092. *Chairman.*—What is your own opinion with regard to the use of the Bible in schools?—That it is unfit as a school book; that it is too sacred to be made a class book; and that the use of it for such purposes, so far from being calculated to increase a reverence or respect for it, is calculated to decrease it; and it is a well-known fact, that frequently in schools, portions of the Sacred Scriptures are applied to very bad purposes by the children who use them. I therefore consider it an unfit school book for children; and in the second place I consider it as derogating from that sanctity and importance in which it ought to be held, to employ it as a class book.

1096. Do you see any peculiar religious benefit to be derived from the mere reading of the Scriptures, without note or comment, by young children?—No; on the contrary, I have already said that I think it derogates from that respect for it which they ought to have, though children may acquire, perhaps, what I might call a prejudice, or certain minds might acquire a prejudice in its favour afterwards, owing to devout family connexions; but a great number of minds would acquire, as it is a well-known fact that they do acquire, a disrespect and disregard for it.

1098. A great deal of stress is laid upon the necessity of securing religious instruction in all schools; do you think that a mere provision that the Bible is to be read without note or comment by young children, and without any explanation, gives any security whatever for this religious instruction which is said to be so necessary?—None whatever. If it were so easily understood by ignorant minds, why the necessity for the lengthened commentaries that we have upon it?

1099. You would say that those who object to mere secular instruction being given in schools, ought still to continue their objection, if all the religious instruction that is imparted is the mere reading of the Scriptures without note or comment?—As I understand the question, I think so; that those who are convinced that religious instruction is requisite, would not have their objection to the secular system removed by merely conceding that the letter of Scripture should be read.

Mr. Hinton expresses a substantially similar opinion.

It has been considered a redeeming feature in the secular scheme that, by leaving the choice of school books to the discretion of school committees, it indirectly permits the introduction of the Bible as a class book ; but this is rather an aggravation of the whole mischief. Even in schools in which Scriptural instruction is fully given, the Bible being made a class-book is an incidental circumstance which, if it were possible, would be advantageously got rid of; but to make it a class-book and nothing else, is to do the worst thing possible with it. In this case, what is obscure in it may not be explained, what is plain may not be enforced ; it is not sure of even being left as a dead letter, for it may be sneered at by the master, and reverence for it may be undermined. Unless it is allowed to take its proper place in the school as to instruction and influence, it would be better that the Bible should be referred, in common with religion as a whole, to extra-scholastic teaching.—*Appendix*, p. 238.

To this judgment the authority of Mr. Kennedy may be added, as given 1379 to 1384.

This fancied mitigation shown to be unavailing, we return to the question before us, what is the system of instruction which, under the name of the Secular scheme, the public is to have? And we first make Dr. M'Kerrow the respondent to this question.

516. *Chairman.*—Would you consider it to be a fair representation of the National Public School Association to say that it proposes to teach natural theology to the exclusion of Christian doctrine ?—Such a representation is a very unfair one, I think. We have never proposed to introduce any system of theology, whether natural or revealed.

It is literally true that Secular educationists "have never proposed to introduce" into public schools "any system of theology, natural or revealed." And this, according to Dr. M'Kerrow, is their boast! Verily, we think they may be classed with those who "glory in their shame." But let us now make Dr. Watts respondent to the same question.

719. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do you not think that founding moral obligation simply on the existence of God is pure deism ?—If moral obligations were to be founded simply on the existence of God, I dare say it would come under that definition.

720. That is a species of moral obligation which you propose to teach ?—That is a species of moral obligation which we propose to appeal to.

Ah! Mr. Cobden! Mr. Cobden! Not even yet do your helpers know what is meant by secular education, although they have had so much longer to consider of it. One thing, however, is plain. At the best the religion of secular schools would be deism, and it might be much worse.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS DEFICIENCY.

In the preceding section we have confined ourselves to the nature of the instruction which it is proposed to impart in the new public schools; we shall now lay before the reader the view which was taken in the Committee

of the adequacy of this instruction considered as a system, and as embracing the whole of education. It is probably so well known to our readers that a supplementary mechanism for the purpose of religious instruction is attached to the secular scheme, that it may seem to them unfair to regard it, even for a moment, as embracing the whole of education. To this supplementary mechanism we hope to do ample justice by and bye; but before proceeding to the consideration of it we feel justified in contemplating it as a complete educational system, because there are unmistakeable indications that its promoters have, at least occasionally, so regarded it themselves. Let the reader observe, for example, the following extract from the evidence of Dr. M'Kerrow, in which the supplementary mechanism is wholly left out of view, and none but the existing means of religious instruction are adverted to, as auxiliary to the public schools.

345. *Chairman.*—You have acknowledged the importance of doctrinal religious instruction; how do you propose then that it should be given?—The parent is the natural guardian of the child, and has the only natural and legitimate right to instil his religious principles into the mind of his offspring. Religious people will in this respect perform their own parental duty; they may be disposed, however, to call for the assistance of others, to increase the amount, or to improve the quality of the religious instruction which they give to their children, and hence Sabbath school teachers and ministers of religion are in such cases generally employed for this purpose. Little fear need be entertained that the large proportion of persons who attend places of worship will neglect the religious instruction of their children. As to the poor and ignorant classes of the community, I apprehend that the religious zeal which professes so much anxiety as we hear of for their spiritual welfare, would continue under a system of national secular instruction to care as much for them as it does at present. Sunday schools would be open as before, and ministers of religion and Christian people in general would be as active as ever, and certainly children who had been taught to read, and who had experienced during the week the advantages of day school discipline, would make much greater progress in religious knowledge by the teaching received on Sunday than is now commonly done, whilst it is evident that all the agencies of Bible and Tract distribution would have a much wider sphere of beneficial operation among the instructed, than among an untaught population.

Dr. Watts, in telling us "what national education ought to comprise," (572) after going through the items of the secular routine, adds emphatically, "So that really this list includes all which can possibly be desired, except sectarian doctrine." And afterwards he makes the following extraordinary statement.

606. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do you not think that if you leave as a matter of indifference all distinctive doctrines, you will reduce religion to something so vague that it cannot exercise any effectual influence over the mind or the actions?—I do not think so, since I am obliged to confess that all these various religions do exercise an effective influence over the mind and the actions, and therefore I am forced to the conclusion that sinking the differential doctrines would not produce such an effect.

607. You were understood to say that all these sects do produce, more or less, a good effect; do you think that proves that a person belonging to no sect at all would have the same advantage?—Provided he held the same sentiments he would have the same advantage.

608. Then you think the advantage is derived solely from something common to all sects?—I do.

According to this philosophy, the secular scheme is not a mere fragment of education, as to moral culture either enforcing precepts by no motives at

all, or employing only the feebler motives supplied by natural religion, and so requiring to be supplemented by other hands; but it is an educational system complete in itself, and adapted to "exercise an effective influence over the mind and the actions." The ground of this assertion is that all sects of religion do actually exercise such an influence, which consequently must be held to arise from something common to them all, so that dropping their distinctive doctrines would not emasculate them. This is prettily conceived; but what is the meaning of it? The distinctive doctrines of all religions being dropped, the thing left (as we have seen) is natural religion, or Deism. Dr. Watts's statement, therefore, amounts to this, that religionists of every name are mainly influenced by the deistical portion of their creed, or by what they believe concerning the being and providence of God. On behalf of one Christian at least, and we are sure for many more, we pronounce the assertion to be untrue. Of whatever importance as fundamental to our faith the being and providence of God may be, we hope we can sincerely say that the great motives which influence us are those supplied by Christianity, and that to rob us of these would totally enervate our moral character. Dr. Watts, on the other hand, must very well know, that there are a vast multitude of persons under every religious name whose mind and actions are under no religious influence at all. "Without God in the world," they are no more influenced by Deism than by Christianity. His assertion, therefore, proceeds on a fallacious estimate of facts, and so utterly falls. The proper mode of considering the question thus raised is to look at the motives respectively which different religious systems present, and, upon the assumption of their reality, to estimate their comparative power. Such a process is not difficult; and if conducted with any fairness, it will certainly lead to the conclusion expressed in the question of Mr. Bowyer—that to "leave as a matter of indifference all distinctive doctrines, will reduce religion to something so vague that it cannot exercise any effectual influence over the mind or the actions." A morality of habit there may be, but we do not see how it is possible there should be more; and this is obviously very far short of well principled and stable virtue. In other words, secular instruction, viewed as education, is essentially defective.

The witness who entered most directly into this part of the subject was Mr. Toole, from whose examination we make the following extracts.

1050. *Chairman.*—When the word "education" is used, what is the meaning which you attach to that word in your body?—I mean the education of the whole man, both body and soul, with reference both to this world and the next, to fulfil the object of his creation: I consider that anything short of that is imperfect.

1057. What are the means that you consider should be adopted for the purpose of carrying out education?—I consider the means that God has appointed to be, first the family, wherein comes parental instruction, family belief, and so on. Then there is the school, and the Church. When I speak of the Church I speak as a Catholic. I consider that no education is complete that has not these three as teachers and guides. The family, during early life especially, from the very earliest years; the school during youth; and the Church from the time of coming to the use of reason through life. Hence the object of all religious services, instructions, preachings, and teachings; all that is education.

1058. *Mr. Bowyer.*—You distinguished between the religious instruction to be acquired in the Church, and the religious instruction to be acquired in the school?—The school is to do its work in the education of the poor man; the school is to instruct for this world as well as for the next, in the beginning;

and the Church is to complete and continue the same work, after the work in the school has ceased.

1059. *Chairman.*—How are those principles to be carried into practice, and made applicable to the education of the poor?—That is the difficulty. In a well-conducted family, amongst religious people, the matter is clear and easy; and where the expenses of education can be defrayed it is easy; but when the poor, especially the poor in our manufacturing towns, are concerned, we must bear in mind that there is scarcely such a thing as supervision and care of a family amongst the poor; there is no such thing, or very little such, as family instruction. The mother is at work, in very many instances, during the day, and the children are left to be cared for by each other; and when the father and mother come home tired at night, we know from sad experience that there is but too little religion amongst the people to make them think it is at all necessary beyond mere generals. Hence I consider that the school has to do still a greater part of the work of education now, and especially in the manufacturing towns, than it would have had to do in former times; or than it would have to do in a less densely populated or less fully employed district.

1116. Do not you think that a system of education purely secular would have a necessary tendency to perpetuate that state of things under which many persons go to no place of worship, and apparently belong to no religion at all?—It would perpetuate it and aggravate it, in my opinion.

1119. You would not wish the child to be put in a school where it would learn nothing but mere deism, or a morality founded on deism?—No, I would not.

1122. Your objection, in point of fact, to schools, as places where deism would be taught, as it were, or where there would be no foundation for morals by faith, would apply to a great portion of the schools which it is proposed to support under this Bill?—I most certainly do believe it.

1125. *Chairman.*—It applies to all schools where the only religious instruction imparted is the reading of the Scriptures in the authorised version?—Yes; I hold that it does lead to . . . deism, and that when the children are preserved from that, some other element is brought in to bear upon them.

1131. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Is there not a certain class of opinions called by Roman-catholic writers "indifferentism?"—Yes, that is * what I have heard once called "the religion of all moralities, and the morality of all religions." It is a sort of Pagan morality.

1132. Is it not strongly objected to by the Catholic Church?—Most undoubtedly, because the Catholic holds faith as the foundation of all religion.

1133. Do you think that a system of secular teaching, without religion and morality, † arising out of religion, must lead necessarily to that indifferentism which is condemned by your Church?—Yes.

1196. *Sir G. Grey.*—I understand your opinion to be decidedly that the best scheme of education is one which combines religious with secular instruction?—Yes; I said in the beginning that I contemplated the education of the whole man, body and soul, for the object for which he is created.

If, however, the Secular system is not absolutely complete and sufficient in itself, may it not be so as a week-day system, supplemented by the Sunday school? This idea is thrown out by Dr. M'Kerrow, and is thus treated by Mr. Hinton.

1613. Do you not thnik that the Sunday school system might be made to supply sufficient religious instruction to the children of the working classes?—I think very highly of Sunday schools, and fully admit their capability of further development and improvement, but I do not think they could supply the place of religious instruction in the day schools.

* Misprinted *where there is what.*

† Misprinted *not arising.*

1614. For what reasons?—First, because I should think it wrong that so large and valuable an opportunity of religious culture as the day school presents should be lost to the young, especially of the working classes. Secondly, because two or three hours of religious instruction on one day of the week would be quite overborne by a course of non-religious instruction (and probably worse) on the other six. Thirdly, because the attendance at Sunday schools can never be co-extensive with that at day schools; and thus a classs, large on the whole, would be destitute of religious instruction altogether.

1615. Are you aware of any instance in which this experiment has been tried?—This experiment has been tried on a large scale, and is now in progress in the United States, where religion, an original element of the common schools, has been gradually thrust out of them, in the faith that the Sunday schools would supply it.

1616. Are you acquainted with the result?—The result is given by Mr. Tremenheere, in his "Notes on Public Subjects," published last year, in which he says, "The theory on which the whole public school system of the United States is based is, that the religious instruction which is not given in the day school is given in the Sunday school, exception, of course, being made in regard to the children of those parents who are able and willing to instruct their children in the doctrines of their own faith at home. In considering, however, a scheme of public instruction having special reference to the poorer and less-educated classes of society, the above qualification may be left out of view, and the proposition may stand as above stated. It is important to ascertain whether this theory is carried out in practice; if it be so in certain parts of the United States, whether this is not so much due to local circumstances that it can afford no safe guide for ourselves; if it fails under different circumstances, whether those are not precisely the circumstances we have to deal with in this country." (p. 8.) "It is clear, from the above facts, that in several of the most conspicuous cities, towns, and seats of manufacturing industry in the free states of the Union, containing populations analagous to those in this country, for which there is the most pressing need to extend the means of education, the theory of a complete education, according to the view adopted in the United States, is not fulfilled in relation to a considerable proportion of the children at their schools; inasmuch as, in the first place, a certain and, in some cases a larger, proportion of the children attending the day schools do not attend the Sunday schools: by far the greater number, indeed nearly the whole, belong to parents incapable of giving religious instruction themselves, or indifferent to it, to the extent to baffle the efforts of the various religious denominations to induce them to attend to the religious welfare of their children. I feel it necessary to add that these conclusions, founded on personal inquiry and statistical facts, are at variance with the first impressions of very many persons, whether officially or practically conversant with the subject or not, whose opinions and impressions I asked for respecting it. To the inquiry, 'Do the children regularly attend Sunday schools, and obtain there the religious instruction which is not given at the day schools?' whether addressed to school teachers, or to gentlemen who only possessed a general acquaintance with the actual working of the system of education, the very common answer was in the affirmative; and it was often a matter of surprise to the teachers themselves, that, on their asking the children present who attended Sunday schools to hold up their hands, so many hands were not held up. I have learnt, in the course of many inquiries of this nature, that general impressions are seldom to be trusted from any quarter, and that they are very apt to be contradicted when brought to the test of accurate inquiry. The conclusion I arrive at from the above facts, drawn from portions of the United States having populations similar to our own, is that, inasmuch as the great majority of all classes and denominations in this country agree, that no system under the sanction of and aided by the State could be consented to which did not, in some way or other, make effectual provision for religious

as well as secular education, the example and experience of the United States, in so far as the localities above referred to are concerned, cannot be quoted as having fulfilled that requirement." (pp. 25—29.)

Dr. Watts attempted to diminish the force of this opinion by elaborately exhibiting the number of children in the United States who did attend Sunday schools. It is a fair average of the items he gives (963) to say that 80 per cent. of the children who attend day schools attend Sunday schools also. There are then twenty in every hundred who do not. On a single million of children this would amount to two hundred thousand; a number surely too large to be coolly abandoned to religious ignorance.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS SUPPLEMENT.

We have last spoken of the system advocated under the name of secular instruction as conceived to constitute the whole of education, or as having at best no other auxiliary than the Sunday-school. We direct attention now to another view of it which is distinctly put forward and strongly insisted in the evidence before us; namely, that the instruction proposed by the secular scheme is not the whole of education, but only a part of it, and that a period of time in the course of the week is to be secured, during which the remainder—the more religious portion—may be supplied. Thus Dr. Watts.

688. *Mr. Christopher.*—Is not your principle this: you think by giving secular instruction alone in these schools, that what you call religious instruction might be supplemented by the clergymen or ministers of religious denominations?—That is precisely my view, adding also the parent.

621. *The Marquis of Blandford.*—What do you mean by that—"supplement the common teaching"?—To follow up the teaching of the school with the teaching of doctrines after or before the regular school hours.

We commence our examination of the scheme under this aspect by inquiring into the nature and force of the reasons assigned for its adoption.

On this subject we do not mean to begin by imputing to the promoters of the secular scheme any improper motive. It would seem that in some quarters (we know not where) a cry has been raised against them as being "hostile to religion," and the scheme itself as "godless and irreligious." In answer to Q. 337 *seq.*, Dr. M'Kerrow strenuously denies these imputations, and asserts that he and his friends "desire to cultivate" in the secular schools "both the spirit and the practice of religion." Be it so; we give credit for such a desire to all who profess it, we only remark that such desires will not affect the working of the system. Nor indeed can it be supposed that a profession of them would be universal. On this matter there is some truth in Mr. Hinton's remark,

It has been strongly asserted that the promoters of the Secular scheme are actuated by no hostility to religion, but that they mean to keep it safe, if not even to favour it, by detaching religious instruction from the school routine. I submit, however, that the promoters of the secular scheme cannot properly be estimated in the lump, since the advocacy of it has associated together men of otherwise very dissimilar character. Some of them are undoubtedly as sincere and ardent friends of religion as are to be found in the world; but others have,

on this matter, to say the least, a very equivocal aspect. I can hardly think that an injury inflicted on Christianity would be very deeply regretted by some men of sufficient notoriety in this group; and I cannot help wondering that eminently religious men have not been somewhat startled by their company. *Appendix*, p. 238.

Let us go on, however, to another point, and notice the attitude in relation to religion in which the secular scheme is placed by its promoters. A question was thus put to Dr. M'Kerrow.

487. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—Are we to take it as your opinion that the secular system is the best in itself, or that it is the only system applicable to the circumstances of this country?—The only system applicable to the circumstances of the country; we do not consider that the secular system is the whole of education, but we consider that it furnishes an amount of education which the country can receive in accordance with the national system.

The same declaration is repeated in answer to Q. 338. And after the same tenor Dr. Watts.

573. *Chairman.*—You think that doctrinal religion ought not to be included in the public school?—I think not, and I should like to give a few reasons why I think it ought not to be included. The first is, because a plan supported by general taxation ought to be equally available to all; but a school inculcating a creed cannot be equally available to all; and therefore it seems to me that the Rev. Dr. Hook rightly said, that the State cannot give a religious education, for to teach one religion would be unjust, to teach all absurd.

685. *Mr. W. Fox.*—But you do not* consider the school as the sole agency in any case whatever of what is properly called education?—Decidedly not; the secular system of instruction, as put forward by the National Public School Association, is put forward to give as much teaching as can be given justifiably upon a rate-built system.

Here we have it confessed in the outset that the scheme of secular schools is not, even in the opinion of its staunchest advocates, "best in itself" for educational purposes; it is a method which even they would not think of preferring on its own account, but an acknowledged injury to scholastic training, to be submitted to for the sake of facilitating the introduction of a system "supported by general taxation." This is in our judgment paying far too high a price for so small a benefit; we should rather say, it is adding one injury to another. What, we may ask, is there in a tax-supported system of schools for the working classes of England, that should make us willing to purchase it at such a cost? It is exhausting education of its highest energies in order that you may throw it, as an almost lifeless carcase, on the state; as you might be supposed to tear out the nervous system of a man in order to get him into the workhouse.

In the very teeth of this acknowledgment, however, we have it expressly set forth by the same witnesses, that the communication of religious instruction is actually facilitated by the separate communication of secular knowledge. Thus Dr. M'Kerrow.

341. *Chairman.*—You wish it to be clearly understood, that the matter at issue between you and others does not refer to the propriety of founding education on a religious basis, but to the question where and by whom this basis should be laid?—Precisely so. I recognise the right of every one to consider his own basis necessary, but it is not requisite that it should be laid by one person at one particular time. It may be better done by the parent at home than by any other person anywhere else; better done by a Sabbath school

* Misprinted *do you not.*

teacher than by the master of a day-school; better done in the bible-class of the Minister than in any other place or circumstance.

Thus also Mr. Bazley.

192. *Mr. Bowyer.*—I understood you to say that secular education would in your opinion be a good preparation for religious education?—I think so.

And thus Dr. Watts.

652. *Chairman.*—It is not hostile to religion?—Decidedly not, but is a necessary preparative for efficient religious teaching.

Here our philanthropic friends are obviously on a different tack. Anon we were told that the secular scheme was not doing the best thing in itself, but only the best thing that could be done by taxation; now, however, we are assured that it really does the best thing in itself, that secular instruction is not only a "good," but "a necessary preparative for religious teaching," and that "the religious basis" of education may be "better" laid—indeed, in a manner "infinitely preferable"—by other parties than by the schoolmaster. It is clear that *both* these statements cannot be true. Which are we to take, gentlemen?

But to let this inconsistency pass. Mr. Bowyer endeavoured to drive Mr. Bazley from his position in the following manner.

192. *Mr. Bowyer.*—I understood you to say, that secular education would, in your opinion, be a good preparation for religious education?—I think so.

193. Do not you think that religious education would be a good preparation for secular education?—Certainly not; if you think for a moment upon the subject, you will find that you cannot convey abstract ideas except by means of the objects which surround us.

194. Do yo mean to say that a child cannot learn to recognise the existence of God, till it has learned arithmetic?—I do not say arithmetic; but the child must have some ideas developed in connexion with this life.

195. Is not the first thing a child generally learns to say its prayer, probably, or something of that kind?—Yes.

196. Does not religious education in every well-ordered family precede secular education?—I apprehend not; because education does not consist merely in the attainments of reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and so forth, but children begin their education the moment they have had their perceptive faculties directed to the world and the objects surrounding them.

197. Do not you think the father or mother begins by teaching the child some religious ideas?—That is frequently the case; but the child must have some ideas developed before it can comprehend such teaching.

198. Supposing a child to have its faculties sufficiently developed to be capable of learning anything, do not you think that in every well-ordered family the first thing taught to the child is some ideas of religion?—It is very possible.

199. Do not you think that circumstance seems to point out that religious education should have the preference to secular?—I apprehend it will be found that we cannot communicate religious ideas without having first some ideas developed of the mundane character which I refer to.

To us it seems that this argument was out of bearing, inasmuch as it carries us back to infancy, and very far away from the school period, which alone is in question. In more direct reference to this period the same member of the Committee had another encounter with Mr. Bazley.

148. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do not you think that the children would be more likely

to learn religion if it were combined with secular instruction, than if it were separated from it?—I think not.

150. Do not you think that, supposing instruction in religion were combined with secular instruction, the children would be more likely to learn religion, than if the teaching of religion were left entirely optional?—I think not; learning is generally irksome; children rebel at lessons which are not palatable; and I believe if they first had a little secular instruction, it would give them a very great facility for receiving religious instruction; and religion being communicated not as a task, but as a moral and elevating element, the effect would be much more beneficial to the child, than if the two were mingled together; and especially if the child were corrected, as I have known children to be, for not exactly understanding a scriptural lesson.

151. Do not you think in every family religion is taught, more or less, as a task?—I think in well regulated families it has been for a great number of years divested of those terrors which were formerly associated with it.

152. I do not speak of terrors; do not you think it is made a task?—To some extent it is, no doubt; but I would observe, that wherever it is made a task I think it is afterwards found to have been a misfortune.

153. You would avoid any kind of teaching being made a terror, would you not?—Certainly.

154. In every family are not children obliged to learn religion?—I fancy religious truths are agreeably inculcated by the mother, or the governess, or some member of the family.

155. Children are obliged to learn certain things by heart?—No doubt.

156. Then it is made a task?—No doubt, in a kind and gentle manner; not under terror of the rod.

157. I suppose you would not wish any teaching to be under terror of the rod?—I would not.

158. Children are expected to learn Scripture lessons, and if they do not learn those lessons they are reprimanded or found fault with?—Those are parental regulations which I apprehend the schoolmaster would not interfere with, nor take cognisance of.

159. Might not the schoolmaster teach religion in precisely the same manner?—I do not think it could be established upon a national basis with anything like common justice or equity.

The answers to the last two questions are palpable evasions. Mr. Bazley certainly meant, yes. The true point of comparison, however, is not between secular instruction at school and religious instruction at home; but between secular instruction under one schoolmaster and religious instruction under another, the extra-scholastic bible class having certainly no advantage over the school routine. We think children would much rather "learn religion" (if that must be the phrase) in combination with the usual school exercises, than attend somewhere for two hours two days in every week to learn nothing else.

But let us resume Dr. Watts's statement. He tells us that secular instruction "is a necessary preparative for efficient religious teaching." Now Dr. Watts is speaking, not of a system of instruction strictly secular, the advantage of which in respect of an aptitude for religious instruction might be held to consist in the quickening and bracing of the faculties, but of a system of instruction which, though called secular, is leavened with the principles of natural religion, *alias* deism—a system of "moral teaching which would, as far as the teaching goes, make the children deists" (624, 625); and it is of this he says that it constitutes "a necessary preparative for religious," that is Christian teaching. We ask, on what ground? And we bid our hearers hearken to his reply.

627. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do you not think that the parents would object to their

children being made in the first instance deists, even although it might be open to them to supply the omission afterwards?—My impression is, that every child must be a deist before he can be a Christian.

630. Do you not think, teaching children deism in the first instance, leaving Christianity to be added, or not added, as the case might be, would produce an impression on the mind of the child more favourable to deism than to Christianity?—I do not think it follows.

632. *The Marquis of Blandford.*—Do you not think that the two systems are so diametrically opposite, namely, the one of revealed Christianity, which is professed by the members of the Church of England and other dissenting communities, and that of the moral theology which would be inculcated in the schools during the week days, that the child would be learning one thing during the week days which would be opposed to that which would be instilled into his mind on the Sunday?—I do not think there is any opposition in the case; I think the teaching of the day-school, if it produces its proper effect, is necessarily the first portion of Christian teaching; I think the child must realize the idea of God before he can take another step in Christian doctrine.

Certainly, after this Dr. Watts need not hesitate, as he always did, to admit that his proposed course of secular instruction "would make the children deists," (625.) It clearly ought to do so, since deism "is necessarily the first portion of Christian teaching," and "every child must be a deist before he can be a Christian." We must say that, in this case, becoming a Christian is a process attended by fearful perils; perils, however, we rejoice to believe, not necessarily incident to the process itself, but most unnecessarily generated by this boasted scheme of secular instruction.

Dr. Watts founds his conception of the mode of becoming a Christian on the apparently innocent statement that "a child must realize the idea of God before he can take another step in Christian doctrine." Admitting this as an isolated proposition, it carries us back to a period far anterior to the school age. And, moreover, it does not follow that a long space of time need elapse between the first and the second lesson; still less that an entire system of deistic instruction and appeal can beneficially be in force at school for five days in the week, leaving only a couple of contingent extra-scholastic bible-classes to supply the lessons of Christianity.

On this subject the following opinion was expressed by Mr. Toole.

1126. *Mr. Christopher.*—From the general tenor of your evidence, may not the Committee infer that you are of opinion that purely secular instruction in the first instance is not in any degree suitable to prepare the child to receive religious impressions afterwards?—I am of that opinion.

1120. You consider that indifferentism might possibly, so far from being a preparation for receiving religious knowledge, be antagonistic to it, and prevent the child from receiving it?—Most certainly; that religious knowledge of which I speak, doctrinal knowledge.

The sentiments of Mr. Hinton on this question are thus given in the Appendix.

The question has been pointedly put, whether secular instruction may not be a valuable preparation for religious instruction; and I answer frankly, if pure, yes; if leavened with infidelity, no. But even the former of these suppositions supplies no reason for dividing two elements, which, it appears to me, go better hand in hand. And such, if I understand it, is the design of the Secular Bill, which allots a portion of time every week as an opportunity for religious instruction. Secular instruction of the latter kind, however, of which there would inevitably be some, and might be a great deal, would be directly and powerfully adverse to the efforts of the religious teacher.—*Appendix*, p. 238.

It is remarkable enough, that, after all, the secular bill proposes no such separation of the deistic from the Christian teaching as to allow time for the production of its alleged advantages. Deism in the morning and Christianity in the afternoon, twice a week, all through the chapter! A truly edifying jumble!

Mr. Bazley, however, goes so far as to deny the right of the schoolmaster to impart religious instruction.

9. *Chairman.*—Is it your opinion, then, that the schoolmaster should not give instruction in the revealed truths of religion, but should be confined to what is called secular teaching?—I entertain the opinion very decidedly that it is not the province of the schoolmaster to give religious instruction; that he ought rather to remove that natural ignorance which belongs to the mind of every uninstructed child, and that the teacher of religion, or the parent of the child, ought to inculcate religious truths.

And one of the schoolmasters brought up from Manchester to aid the secular cause, Mr. Cuffe, meets us with the following statement of a similar opinion.

In my opinion, religious teaching does not properly belong to the schoolmaster, and ought not to be transferred to him. God has constituted parents the first teachers of their children, and they are the most suitable persons to sow the seeds of religion. Who more so than the mother? It is true, that many parents know not, care not for religion. Then the question arises, are those children to be neglected? Certainly not; it is the special duty of ministers of religion to care for the young. Are they obeying the command of their Master? Are they walking in his footsteps when they neglect the young? Should they not feed the lambs? Are they merely to devote their attention to the aged, and leave the young (from whom they expect to have their churches supplied when the parents are dead) uncared for? In my opinion, such children ought not to be left to the necessarily inefficient teaching of the public or Sunday schools.—*Appendix*, p. 266.

Without differing at all from what this gentleman says of the value of parental, or the obligation of ministerial instruction, and without pleading for a moment that children should be *left* to the teaching of the public or the Sunday schools, we ask why religious teaching should be excluded from the public schools? If it really be so that "religious teaching does not properly belong to the schoolmaster," then the advocates of the secular scheme have no need to apologize for themselves as having not done the best thing, but only the best thing they could under the circumstances; on the contrary, they have done absolutely the best thing, and their only blunder has been in not expelling religious teaching from the secular schools altogether. Mr. Cuffe, in his eager zeal, goes too far even for the friends whom he would help, and certainly much beyond the limits of truth. We hold the schoolmaster to be for the time *in loco parentis*, and to be charged with the work of education as a whole; and while we quite admit that the work of other people ought not to be transferred to him, we must maintain also that his work ought not to be transferred to them.

Another misdirected argument of the same class may be noticed here. It is brought forward by Dr. Watts.

577. *Chairman.*—On the adjournment of the Committee, you were giving some reasons why doctrinal religion ought not to be taught in day schools; have you anything to add upon that head?—Yes. I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact, that whilst religion is by all persons allowed to be the most important kind of teaching, it seems by general consent to be allowed

also, that it is proper for a man to spend some four or five years in a collegiate course of instruction before he is considered competent as a public teacher of theology. I submit, that if this judgment be worth anything, since all the teachers of youth cannot possibly be so qualified, and since early impressions are most important, it would be wise in public schools to remit the doctrinal portion of the teaching into the hands of the gentlemen who have been specially prepared for it. It seems to me that if this be not done (and I think we have evidence in the Reports of her Majesty's Inspectors upon that subject), that there is great danger of erroneous teaching, and of permanent false impressions. I would also submit, that if it were possible for the day-school teachers, with such opportunities of information as they have, and with such opportunities of study as most of them can command before they commence to teach in a day school, that if they be competent as theological teachers, then by implication the clergy and dissenting ministers are not needed, and schoolmasters might as well fill the pulpits as the day schools.

Dr. Watts's care for the edification of dissenting congregations is exceedingly benevolent and amiable, and we beg to tender him the thanks of the nonconformist body. There is one reason, however, why, whatever be their qualifications, the schoolmasters may not "as well fill the pulpits as the day school," namely, that they work too hard all the week to be available for any such service on the sabbath. But Dr. Watts obviously confounds things that differ when he speaks of schoolmasters as "public teachers of theology," a point on which he was directly answered by Mr. Hinton.

1607. *Chairman.*—Do you think that the teachers of public schools generally are qualified to give religious instruction to children ?—I fear many are not; but all may be so. The Committee will allow me to observe that religious instruction is divisible into two great departments, the one systematic and the other elementary. The character of the elementary instruction will of course depend upon the system to which it belongs; but when you have chosen your system, the elementary instruction which is to accord with it is always extremely simple. If for example, you take Romanism or Judaism, you will find it so. Now, I choose for my system that which is commonly called Evangelical, and which is held in common by a large number of Nonconformist bodies, together with many members of the Church of England. This being assumed, the religious instruction to be given is perfectly simple, and the piety of the teacher (which is an essential point) being also assumed, the religious instruction is perfectly easy. I am no believer in the necessity of clerical orders or collegiate education. I hold rather the maxim of the late Robert Robinson of Cambridge, that any man who understands the Gospel can teach it; and I am sure that many unlearned men, having sincere piety and a little common sense, can teach religion a great deal better than some whose names have been followed by a diploma, and whose heads have been adorned by a mitre.

1608. From some examples which have been given, it would seem that in many cases children derive but little benefit from the religious instruction they receive at school ?—The fact as stated, whatever be its exact amount, is much to be regretted; yet it would be unfair to condemn either all children or all schools for the inattention or negligence of some. In all probability where the religious instruction is found inefficient, other branches of instruction would be found equally so. In as far, however, as religious instruction may be inefficient, this fact may serve to account, at least in part, for the small amount of moral reformation which the criminal returns show to have arisen from the increase of education, and at which so much surprise has been expressed. The proper remedy for this evil would be, not to exclude religious instruction from the schools totally, but to improve the manner of its communication.

If there is in Dr. Watts's opinion any force in the argument he here adduces, we say, as before, that he has no need to apologize for secular schools that they are only the best thing which can be done under the

circumstances of the country; they are in that case absolutely the best thing, and he ought to claim the approbation and gratitude of the country for this attempt to save it from "erroneous teaching and false impressions." We submit to him, however, that, on this ground, he ought to exclude from public schools religion altogether, since the schoolmasters must be quite as ill qualified to teach deism as Christianity. Some of the hardest problems in Christianity itself relate to the character of God, human responsibility, and future punishment, and are common, indeed to all religions.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS MACHINERY.

From the reasons alleged for the separation of religious from secular instruction, we proceed to contemplate the method by which it is conceived that religious instruction may be supplemented. The secular scheme "proposes that the schools shall be closed once or twice a week, so that ministers of religion, or others authorised by religious denominations, may give the more special teaching which parents may wish their children to receive." Of this provision Dr. M'Kerrow expresses a very high opinion, and he assures us that it would "more than compensate" for the absence of religious instruction from the schools (348). We confess ourselves of a different mind. We will, however, in the present section confine ourselves to an examination of the machinery itself, the efficiency of which for its professed purpose is liable to very grave question. Upon this point we have chiefly to refer to the evidence of Mr. Hinton.

1535. *Chairman.*—Do you think the suppcsition of the efficiency of the plan, so far as it goes, is likely to be correct?—There is every reason to believe that the plan would be inefficient. This is visible in the nature of the plan itself. It is not proposed to do anything but, at certain hours to close the school doors. The promoters of the secular scheme kindly tell us, indeed, that this shall be done, "in order to afford the scholars an opportunity of attending the instructions of teachers of religion; but they distinctly warn us that "no influence" shall be used to secure or promote the improvement of it. What can result from such a plan as this? The children are just to be thrown, for certain hours, back upon the hands of their parents or friends, if they have any. This is all we are to be indebted to the Bill for. And on the whole, it may be regarded as a positive mischief, from the large amount of truancy inevitably incidental to it. See question 444—50, where the truancy is admitted by Dr. M'Kerrow.

The passage of Dr. M'Kerrow's examination in which this admission was reluctantly drawn from him is the following.

444. *Mr. Miles.*—Have any poor parents at Manchester ever complained to you of having sent their children out to school and the children not going to school, actually playing truant?—Yes.

445. Is that very frequently the case?—Yes.

446. Does it not strike you that if, according to your proposition, secular education were carried on for four days and a half or five days a week, and they had to attend another denominational school to get religious instruction the other day or day and a half, and the children played truant so much to one school, that they would not like the double imposition of attending two?—I

have no doubt in some cases the children might be inclined to absent themselves from that religious instruction, but I have just as little doubt in others they would avail themselves of it; it would depend on the order and discipline of the family; wherever you have parents who have any influence over their children, I conceive that those children would go to receive their religious instruction just as readily and as gladly as the secular.

447. Are there not a vast number of parents in Manchester who have literally but little control over their children, and that control very often put to bad purposes?—I have no doubt there are a very large number, and in those cases it must be the duty of religious people to take care of those children; and to look after them, and persuade them to come.

448. Then this attendance of a day and a half for religious education must be compulsory in that case, must it not?—No, I should have no compulsion in reference to attendance on religious instruction.

449. From what you have stated, would there not be the greatest difficulty in getting children of this class to attend the day and a half, (supposing the secular education was compulsory), for the religious education, supposing that was not compulsory?—There would with a certain class of children exist that difficulty, unquestionably.

450. Taking Manchester, would not that be a considerable class?—Yes, I imagine that would be a considerable class, but still I think that the great object is accomplished in having the children brought to the secular school; and in proportion as they receive instruction in that school, so I think they would be able to receive, and be disposed to receive, additional instruction from all religious exercises.

Yes, Dr. M'Kerrow, "that would be a considerable class;" and it would be altogether contrary to the nature of things that the teaching in secular schools should tend to diminish it. Instruction in deism is not exactly the thing to commend attention to Christianity.

Mr. Hinton's examination proceeds.

1536. *Chairman.*—But suppose the children generally would attend?—If the children would generally, or even universally attend, the opportunity being given, no adequate machinery exists for instructing them. The idea of course is, that religious teachers of the several denominations shall be in attendance at some suitable place at the specified hours, in readiness to receive and instruct the children of their respective connexions. In particular places it is just possible that such a conception might be realized; but, taking the country generally, it is altogether out of the question. First, it would require places for meeting, not only suitable in themselves, but suitably located near the school-room. Such places do not exist. Secondly, it would require persons not only of suitable qualifications, but under responsibility for regular attendance and instruction at the specified hours. With respect to ministers of religion, of whose duty to the young much has been said, this would be imposing a gratuitous and onerous labour upon those who have already enough, and in many cases too much to do; but in the country generally, with the exception of the parochial clergy, who of course are everywhere, neither in this nor in any other form do the required persons exist.

1537. You do not then agree in the opinion of Dr. M'Kerrow, that "there is enough of religious principle and feeling in the country to supply the religious element?"—I do not. If there were any place in England where such a result might be expected, it would be the town and neighbourhood of Manchester; but the Dean of Manchester has pronounced his judgment of the impracticability of the plan proposed, even there. With respect to the country at large, and more especially its rural districts, whatever the amount of "religious feeling and principle" may be, it is notorious that the usual religious denominations do not everywhere exist, and where they do, often not in such strength as to be able to take this care of their own children. Very much the contrary.

1538. Have you no confidence then in the voluntary principle for the support of religion?—Yes, for the support of religion generally.

1539. Have you no confidence in it for the spreading of religion amongst the young by early training?—Yes, among the young generally; but this question affects the denominations. I have no confidence that the Baptist denomination, for example, has the means of taking care of its own children out of school, inasmuch as there are many places where there are the children of Baptists and no Baptist teachers.

A question was here interposed by a member of the Committee respecting the places.

1540. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Why should not the religious instruction be given in the school?—The Bill does not direct it so; the managers might open the school to religious teaching, as is done in Ireland, but the Bill does not allow it as draughted.

This subject was afterwards referred to in the following manner.

1577. *Mr. Miles.*—Is it possible, supposing this secular school to be a mixed school, that the teachers of the various denominations after those hours should come into that one school, and take their different classes in different corners of the room?—I should take that to be excessively awkward; and in many cases impossible.

The course of the examination was then resumed.

1541. *Chairman.*—Do not you think that, if religious objects were alone in view, the zeal of the different denominations would be sufficient to supply these teachers, and to support them?—It is absolutely beyond possibility.

1542. Would your remark apply to the Church Establishment?—They are ubiquitous; they are everywhere.

Not so, however, other religious denominations, upon whom Dr. Watts thus directly lays no inconsiderable part of the labour.

872. *Chairman.*—It is feared that religious teaching would be neglected under the plan of the National Public School Association?—My reply is, that that is a charge against religious organisations, and not against the National Public School Association.

873. *Mr. Miles.*—Taking the whole of England, and particular parts, do you think that religious organisation is so fully established, as respects the different denominations, that they are enabled to take a child from the tenderest age, and by that religious organisation to train him up in the way he should go?—I do, decidedly. I do not know a place anywhere where religious organisations could not do that.

874. And that without the help of the schoolmaster?—And that with the obligatory help of the schoolmaster only for general secular instruction, and so much religion as the sects agree upon.

878. Knowing as you do the state of the lower classes of the community in large towns, and the present state of indifference relative to education, do you suppose that that religious education which you think should be given at home would be given at home by the parents of such children?—By some parents it would not be given; but, as I have already stated, the existing religious organisations would know that this religious teaching would depend upon them; they would feel their responsibility, and they would make arrangements for the performance of the duty.

To this bold and unqualified statement, Mr. Hinton replied in the following terms.

1544. *Chairman.*—It has been stated that "there is no deficiency of machinery now in the country for the promulgation of Christian instruction," and that "if the existing means were well applied, they would be adequate to supply any deficiency of religious instruction arising from its not being given in the day schools." Are you of this opinion?—This statement can have been

made only of the Established Church, which, of course, presents a ubiquitous machinery; but I scarcely think that the parochial clergy will personally and gratuitously take on themselves the entire extra-scholastic instruction of the children of the working classes, and I am sure that there is a very large portion of the community who would not be willing to confide it exclusively to them. Dr. Watts, indeed, stated that "he did not know" of any place in England where the denominational religious machinery was insufficient for the educational purpose contemplated; but, without any disrespect to this gentleman, I must caution the Committee against being guided by his knowledge on this matter. That many such places exist must be evident from a single statement, namely, that in England and Wales, where there are more than 10,000 parishes, there are less than 2,000 Baptist congregations. So, with varying numbers, of all denominations, the Established Church excepted. Children of all denominations are dispersed over the whole country, and teachers are not. Suppose there were a dozen Baptist children in a small town within reach of no Brptist teacher?

1545. *Mr. Miles.*—In some districts would it not peculiarly affect the Roman Catholics?—Yes.

1546. There are in villages now sometimes only two or three Catholic families?—Yes.

1547. *Chairman.*—How does it work in the case of those few Baptist children in a rural parish; would you have an exclusively Baptist school there?—They get all the instruction they get in the schools of other denominations. If each denomination takes care only of its own children, they will get no care at all.

1548. Supposing there was a secular school in a rural parish, and the Baptist children went there and learnt reading, writing, and arithmetic, might not the case be as well as it is now, that for the religious instruction they should go to some place of worship, or to somebody else, to receive it?—Not if they are now in a school where they have religious instruction.

1549. *Mr. Miles.*—We will suppose a secular school and a Church of England school in the same parish; as a Baptist minister, should you hesitate one instant where you would recommend the child of one of your congregation to go?—Surely not; I should say, "Go to the Church of England school rather than to the secular school, if good religious instruction can be got there."

1550. *Chairman.*—Might it not go to the secular school, and go to the chapel on Sunday?—It might, no doubt; that would depend on the feeling of the parents.

1551. *Mr. Miles.*—Taking the feeling of the Baptists, generally speaking, throughout the country, do they not consider it essential that in their elementary schools the doctrines of religion should be taught?—Undoubtedly, generally.

1552. *Chairman.*—Do you mean that they are not very particular what doctrines are taught, provided some doctrines are taught?—I think they are very particular as to the general doctrines of the gospel; I would apply the term "evangelical" to them, as a term well understood.

1553. Supposing those few Baptist children happen to be in a parish where there was a Puseyite clergyman?—I should be very sorry for them; their condition would be hard and bad. My only point is, however, that the machinery required by this Bill does not exist. It would exist if every denomination had a machinery like the Church of England; but four-fifths of the parishes in England have no Baptist teacher, and it is not materially different with other denominations.

1554. *Sir G. Grey.*—How is the education of those latter children provided for in those parishes?—In the best way possible.

1555. Do they receive education in common schools?—If they cannot get it from other schools; in no systematic way.

1556. Do schools exist in which these children actually receive education, or under the present system, or rather want of system, are they debarred?—There is no system; every parent has to get education in the best way he can for his child.

1557. Is it within your knowledge that they do receive education, or do they attend no schools?—They attend schools if they are within reach; they are not voluntarily uneducated; wherever there are schools they attend them.

1558. If they are within reach of schools which the religious opinions of the parents enable them to attend?—To any school; they would go to a secular school rather than to none.

1559. Then they are not at present debarred from receiving instruction in schools?—They take their full share in the instruction that is to be had in the country of every kind.

1560. *Chairman.*—How can they be in any worse position if there was a secular school in the parish than they are now; because whatever religious instruction they get now, they would still continue to get, and, in addition, would have the advantage of being enabled to go to this secular school?—If they now go to a religious school, they get religious instruction in the school. If that were done away with, and they were obliged to go to the secular school, there they would get no religious instruction. It might be a place where there were no Baptist teachers to take care of them.

1561. Is there not some danger of proselytism being carried on; would it not be safer for Baptist children to go to a secular school, rather than to the school of another denomination, and in that way perhaps be induced to change their faith?—Within the limit of what are called evangelical communions, no sect cares a straw, I may say, about proselytism, so far as education is concerned. I should not like my children made Roman-catholics or Unitarians of; but within the circle that is called evangelical among Dissenters, comprehending all names, and the Church of England, we do not care about proselytism. My child, if he be made to fear God and love Christ, I care very little in comparison whether he be a Baptist or Pædo-Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, or Churchman.

1562. Supposing these few members of the Baptist community were residing amidst a Roman-catholic population, where it would be necessary, if schools are to be denominational, they must be Roman-catholic, how would you approve of their having no schools open to them except one which would endanger their being trained up in the Roman-catholic faith?—I should pity them very much; and, if I knew the case, do my utmost to provide a school for them.

1563. Suppose they were few in number and you could not have a Baptist school for them, would it not be better to have a secular school?—I would sooner they should go to a secular school than to a Roman-catholic school.

1564. *Mr. W. Fox.*—You say that church teaching would be acceptable to the Baptist children; is there any need to look further than the Church, then, for the organization which you say does not exist?—I do not say that the Church teaching would be acceptable to Baptist children. The formularies of the Church are repulsive to me. I recoil from the Church Catechism being taught, because of the falsehood and error in it: but if there were no other than Church of England schools, I would rather my child should go there than to the secular schools, if evangelical religious instruction were given there. I look to the power of Gospel truth, and attach a value to it which would satisfy me upon that point. This, however, is not the case universally, nor, I suppose, in the majority of cases.

In addition to this argument of Mr. Hinton's, that the denominational machinery does not exist, we are indebted for another bearing on the same point to Dr. Watts. It occurs in the following part of his examination.

579. *Chairman.*—In reference to the system of denominational teaching, as being the only practicable* system, do you know whether any large proportion of the working classes are wholly unconnected with religious denominations?—I know that in large towns a very large proportion of the working classes are wholly unconnected with all religious denominations; and it seems to me that

* Misprinted *practical.*

these men ought not to be obliged to pay for the religious teaching which they do not accept.

580. *Mr. Bowyer.*—What do you mean by "unconnected with any religious denominations?"—That they do not attend any places of religious worship, or if they do attend, it is casually, sometimes at one, and sometimes at another place.

581. What proportion do you think there is of that condition in Manchester?—I have made many inquiries on the subject, and I know a great number of working men myself; the opinion varies to this extent; that in large towns from one in ten to one in fifty of the working classes are connected with religious congregations.

582. And the others are not?—Yes.

We are inclined to agree in the substantial accuracy of this painful statement. And upon it we ask, what could the denominational organizations do with these? Once out of school, there is no body that can claim them, no hand that can grasp them. Yet to be turned out of school is all that the secular bill proposes for them. Dr. Watts, however, is at no loss.

693. Then, admitting it was true that there was only 1 in 50 who did belong to any acknowledged sect, how would you supplement that religious instruction to which you have referred, in those schools in which the rule was secular instruction?—I think that is a field for existing religious organisations, and for further voluntary effort.

694. And that you would entirely leave to voluntary effort?—Yes.

695. But suppose the parents of these 49 children did not belong to any religious denomination whatever, as you stated, how would these children receive by voluntary efforts, or any efforts at all, any religious instruction?—There are very many agencies now at work which induce those children to go to Sunday schools, and those agencies would work also to induce them to attend the extra hours of instruction, which instruction would be wholly religious; and the agencies would be the more active, inasmuch as the existing organisations would feel that this religious instruction depended wholly on them, and feeling their responsibility, they would do the work very much better than it is now done, when nobody knows whose duty it is.

It is wonderful what capabilities in the eyes of Dr. Watts voluntaryism has for religious purposes, but we think he draws too largely on it. That, if the country were visited with so great a calamity as a system of secular schools, Christian zeal would be in some degree awakened to supply the want of religious instruction in them, is, we are happy to think, not only probable, but certain, but it is in our judgment no less certain that it would be found utterly inadequate to the work to be done. Let any considerate person only conceive of people all over the kingdom employing themselves in seeing that reluctant children attend the extra hours of religious instruction two days in the week! Yet see how easy it is!

698. *Chairman.*—Would not the fact of these children being collected together in a room, even if it were only for secular instruction, place them all within the reach, as a matter of convenience to the religious bodies, and give to the religious bodies a knowledge of the existence of these children, and make it a more practicable thing to induce them to come to the Sunday schools, and other places where religious instruction was given?—I think it would be a very great convenience, and the discipline of the day school would assist the religious school very materially.

699. Have you not heard it stated that one advantage of collecting the militia together was that these young men could receive lectures, and also many useful and religious branches of instruction, whereas they could not be communicated with at all, if they had been dispersed separately about the country?—I have not heard that, but I can easily conceive the utility of such a course.

700. Would not the same thing arise in the case of these schools?—Exactly.

Before such a wise suggestion as this all difficulty vanishes in a moment. Assembled like the militia! Exactly: only the militia are under command, which the children, unlucky little urchins! at present are not. How poverty-stricken for arguments must honourable and right honourable gentlemen be, before they would have recourse to such twaddle as this!

Mr. Hinton continues his review of the machinery of the secular bill by the following passage, which we take from the Appendix.

If the machinery assumed by the Bill were really existing, and if the children were actually in attendance, religious instruction would, on the plan proposed, be given under the greatest possible disadvantages. First, the classes would be incongruous. In school, classes are formed by similarity of age and acquirements; here they would be formed solely by denominational religious affinity; so that a very small class might, and in all probability would, be composed of children in the most important respects extremely dissimilar, children of all ages, and of all grades of ignorance. Secondly, the state of the children's minds would be unsuitable. A couple of hours' release from school would be more like a holiday than a lesson of any kind, and most of all unlike a lesson on so serious a subject as religion. Thirdly, the time would be too long. On no subject does a wise schoolmaster detain the attention of children for two hours, or a single hour, at a time; half an hour would be much nearer the mark. During two hours to be spent continuously in religious instruction, it would be impossible that the interest could be kept up. Fourthly, the instruction must be without practical application. No opportunity would be given for knowing the habits or watching the conduct of the children, so that no advice could be given pertinent to individuals, and nothing in the way of moral discipline could be attempted. No combination of circumstances could be more powerfully adapted to render religious instruction disagreeable and unprofitable.—*Appendix*, p. 238.

The examination of Mr. Hinton proceeded as follows, in relation to the effect of the secular bill on existing schools.

1565. *Chairman.*—You have spoken hitherto of schools to be created under the Bill; but existing schools may also be aided from the rate?—I have spoken hitherto of schools to be created under the Bill; I now add that its effect on existing schools to be aided by the rate would be equally deplorable.

1566. What is your objection to the provision made in this respect?—In order to receive aid from the rate, it is required "that the inculcation of doctrinal or sectarian opinions shall not take place at any time on any week day between the hours of —— and —— in the morning, and —— and —— in the afternoon." This regulation would be of comparatively little moment, if the topics denoted as doctrinal or sectarian were only such as divided orthodox sects, such as Baptists and Congregationalists, or even Dissenters and Churchmen, ecclesiastically from each other, but it becomes of the greatest importance when it is recollected that it would banish from the general school routine the entire evangelical or Christian element; a result to evangelical Nonconformists (and I should suppose to evangelical Churchmen) absolutely intolerable.

Mr. Hinton's final objection to the machinery of the Secular bill is drawn from its unworkable character.

1567. *Chairman.*—Have you any further objection to the provision of this Bill in relation to religious instruction?—I would draw the attention of the Committee to the evident impossibility of enforcing it. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the prohibition of doctrinal religion and sectarian opinion constitute theoretically the security against such teaching which is to be desired, let us see how the matter will stand in practice. First, a parent who shall have reason to believe that any doctrinal or sectarian opinion has been taught may complain to the Committee. It is evident that very much would

be endured before such complaint would be made, and it is highly probable that parents would adopt the much easier remedy of keeping the child from school. The complaint made, the necessity of defining what is doctrinal or sectarian would hopelessly perplex both complainant and Committee ; while the necessity of proofs, possibilities of misunderstanding, and opportunities of denial, would make the inquiry anything but useful or agreeable. Dissatisfied with the decision of the Committee, however, a parent may appeal to the National Board of Education. Only imagine this ! A working man or a widow woman in Cornwall, Cumberland, or Carnarvonshire, instituting a trial on appeal before three great gentlemen in London, against the schoolmaster and the school committee of his or her district, on a charge of doctrinal or sectarian teaching ! The idea is ludicrous. And then, if they should get through so grave a case, and make an order, " it shall be the duty" of the party to obey. But suppose he will not do his duty ? Is there any penalty for disobedience, or any means of enforcing the order ? None whatever. So that the whole affair is a farce. It is then plain, that, in defiance of this Bill, doctrinal religion and sectarian opinions may be taught in the schools to a great extent without remedy. And what is worse than this, a great deal of irreligion and insinuated or open infidelity may be taught, without even a right of complaint, for this the Bill does not in any manner prohibit.

Such is the value of this boasted machinery ! It is utterly inefficient for its purpose, and thus unsatisfactory, even if its purpose were good.

Mr. Hinton having thus taken his ground, he had to maintain it under the following cross-examination :—

1568. *Chairman.*—Surely, supposing, for instance, a few members of one of the evangelical divisions of Christians were residing in a Roman-catholic district, it would be a great advantage to them, (if no religious instruction should be given,) to be able to go to a Roman-catholic school, and get the secular instruction under that provision that no religious instruction should be given in a rate-assisted school at certain hours ?—In the specified circumstances.

1569. Would it not also be an advantage to such children to be able to go to a Unitarian school on similar grounds ?—No doubt.

1570. If it happened to be a school in the district of one of the religious bodies that you have alluded to, of an evangelical kind, why then a child could take not only the secular, but the religious instruction ?—Yes.

1571. But in a case where there was a strong objection to the religious instruction, they could take the secular only ?—No doubt those advantages are fairly stated.

1572. What is the objection on the part of these evangelical bodies to having this separation, if we are to assist schools by rates ; if they can either have the religious instruction or not, as the case may be, what becomes of the objection, as far as the existing schools are concerned ?—The specified cases are merely exceptional cases, and not normal ones.

1573. This Bill contemplates assisting the schools, upon condition that their pecular doctrinal instruction shall not be given at certain hours ?—The evil would be, that the main body of instruction would be emasculated of its religious character and influence.

1574. Can you teach doctrinal instruction at the same time that you are teaching other instruction ?—You may exercise a strong religious influence, and appeal to the children on Christian, or evangelical religious motives.

1575. During the whole course of instruction, when a child is learning arithmetic or geography, the schoolmaster cannot continually then be appealing to religious sanctions ?—Clearly not. The case is this : the child spends three hours at school ; one half hour he is learning geography, another, learning arithmetic, but during those three hours he is under the moral and religious culture and training of the master or mistress,* and is liable to be appealed to for virtuous actions, or corrected for vicious ones ; and every moment there

* Misprinted *masters*.

should be bearing on him a religious influence. If he were to tell a lie, which he may do in the learning of a lesson of arithmetic, the rebuke for the lie is not part of the lesson, but comes afterwards. He is to be told, not that the lie is objectionable on certain pagan moral grounds,, but should be told, " My child, you have displeased God ; you have need to repent ; God has seen it and heard it ; you should look to Christ for forgiveness." Fear of God, love to Christ, and repentance should be the remedy of that fault ; so that while training of that character wants religious, evangelical, gospel motives, which are not only some of the motives to real morals, but the motives in which true morality is rooted, —and real moral virtuous character seems impossible unless rooted in evangelical religion, or in Gospel truth,—those motives and principles should be continually applied throughout the day, month, or year that the child is at school. For the working classes it is the only chance they have for any rooted moral character being produced in them.

1584. *Sir G. Grey.*—Do you think a strict regard to truth, justice, kindness, and forbearance in their intercourse with their fellow-creatures, temperance, industry, frugality, and all other virtues conducive to the right ordering of practical conduct in the affairs of life, cannot be properly inculcated unless they are inculcated on the ground of Christianity, or based on Christian principle ? —Decidedly so.

On the provision for existing schools Mr. Hinton was further examined as follows.

1578. *Sir G. Grey.*—Are you aware of the provision in the 19th clause of this draft of the Bill, by which any existing school, which may include a denominational school, may be admitted into union with this association, upon condition that the inculcation of doctrinal religion and sectarian opinions shall only take place at certain hours ?—Yes.

1579. Does that alter the opinion you have expressed as to the objectionable character of the scheme ?—Not at all.

1580. Would there not be a difference between those schools and the schools proposed originally to be established under this Bill ?—Scarcely a difference. The original schools under the Bill would give secular instruction except in certain hours, during which hours it would turn the children adrift. The existing schools coming under this Bill would equally exclude religion from certain hours, and employ other hours, at the pleasure of the teacher, in giving religious instruction.

1581. Might not that pleasure of the teacher be controlled by the will of the managers of the school just as much as it is now ; if teachers were appointed, the managers might require that they should teach doctrinal teaching during those hours ?—Yes.

1582. Do you see a difference between the two classes ?—Yes.

1583. Does that difference remove your objection to the scheme ?—No ; my objection being that religious influence and training ought not to be excluded from the school routine.

1585. *Chairman.*—Is it not this sort of thing with regard to existing schools, that the corporations, or whatever the bodies may be that raise these rates, take a power of dealing, as it were, with existing schools for certain parts of what existing schools have to dispose of ? They deal with them for some part of the secular instruction ; but they say, " We will not take any more from you ;" the corporation says, " You will carry on your school in the way that you think fit ; but we will only purchase of you certain portions of your instruction, and that portion is merely the reading and writing and the arithmetic. We will leave you to carry on your theological course, and your doctrinal teaching, as you think fit ; but in return for the payment we make you, we require you to give the children certain particular secular knowledge ?"—But they do it upon this condition, that during the great bulk of school hours the religious element shall not be in operation.

1586. The doctrinal teaching ?—Yes ; thereby meaning evangelical influence. Dr. M'Kerrow stated expressly that no Christian motives must be used.

An effort was made by the chairman of the Committee to gain some advantage by a comparison between public and private schools.

1587. *Chairman.*—In a private school in this town, would there be any objection to a person of the most serious turn of mind on religious subjects, if he heard that any particular private school, where, we will say, arithmetic was extremely well taught at a particular hour, sending his child, and paying the parties for teaching the arithmetic at that hour ?—None whatever.

1588. Would it interfere with anything that was going on in that school ?—In no way.

1589. Why is it different to giving these corporations power to deal with existing schools for certain things ; what difference is there between that and an individual sending his child to a school during the time when a particular thing is taught, and paying for that instruction ?—I think there is a great difference, inasmuch as a condition is made in the one case which is not made in the other.

1590. If I sent my child to a school with the understanding that I was to pay so much during the time, and that he was to be taught a given thing, I should not consider the contract was fulfilled if something else were taught in the hour ?—You take all chance of what may be taught there, or done there, in respect of religion. If the master is a pious master, and thinks proper to reprove your child, you can have no bar against it. If you send your child there, and he commits a fault, and you say he shall not be religiously appealed to, you make a specific condition with which a master would probably not comply. Here you do not take your chance, but you say, you shall not have a share of the rate, except you exclude from the school routine all religious habits and training belonging to the school.

1591. There is a distinction between doctrinal teaching and a course of religious instruction, and mere momentary correction ?—If by doctrinal teaching you mean what divides [evangelical] sects in England from one another, I care not at all about it ; but if by doctrinal teaching you mean that which divides Protestant from Papist, Jew from Christian, Unitarian from Trinitarian, and perhaps Mormonite from Christian too ; these things are vital and essential, and affect the character of the entire discipline.

1592. *Sir G. Grey.*—To take the more simple case which you put just now, of a child receiving strictly secular education, and in the course of that telling a lie, you appeared to conceive, under the rules of this association, a schoolmaster would be precluded from pressing on the conscience of that child that a lie was a sin in the sight of God, and inducing the child to look for pardon through his Saviour ; do you think that that would be a violation of the rule which prohibits doctrinal teaching ?—Clearly, as interpreted by the advocates of it. Dr. M'Kerrow stated here that no Christian motives must be appealed to under the Bill.

1593. Looking at the terms "doctrinal religion," and " sectarian opinions," do you think that that would be a violation of the Bill ?—Yes.

1594. Your objection appears to be, that an appeal to the highest motives is excluded by the provisions of this Bill from these schools in which secular * instruction is given ?—Yes.

1595. Would that objection equally apply, provided children were detained during other hours, and then instructed in the doctrines of the Christian faith ?—Not equally apply ; but powerfully, inasmuch as I could not consent to have the religious element extruded from the bulk of the school routine. And besides, it by no means follows on the other system that they would get religious instruction at all ; they might play truant and get nothing.

1596. *Chairman.*—Yet in schools as now conducted religious teaching is kept apart from other subjects ?—This is only partially true ; I may admit that masters do not teach religion at the same time that they are teaching geography, and that the children are not attending to arithmetic while they are in the Bible-

* Misprinted *religious.*

class; but a religious watchfulness and influence is to be exercised by the masters over the children every moment. How inseparable the religious element is from the whole course of education, is evident from evidence given before the Committee last year (2054).

A comparison was now drawn between children at school and youths placed out in life.

1597. *Chairman.*—Now, boys are in other situations of life besides the school; take them in all the various trades and occupations of life; on board ship for instance, and in various other situations; when a boy tells a lie he is made sensible it is very wrong, and they can correct him without on each occasion, making a sort of doctrinal appeal: they can make a general appeal to a superintending Providence?—Do not you allow a difference between education and the period devoted to school instruction, and the discipline of after life? I take education to be carried on *in loco parentis*.

1598. We are speaking of particular things being taught. Take the case of a boy on board ship; he is being taught to do certain things; in the course of his duty he tells a falsehood; the person who is in authority over him corrects him for that falsehood, and makes him sensible that it is wrong, and that he will be punished if it is repeated, and he may, if he please, make an appeal to a superintending Providence. It does not appear to be necessary with a young boy to go into a doctrinal discussion on each occasion of that sort?—I am not of that opinion.

1599. Now, taking the case of a ship, you could not provide that the crew of that ship should all be of a particular religious denomination; but nevertheless, you would have ample power, or some authority would have ample power, to correct such offences as telling falsehoods, and so forth, and effectually to correct them?—For the purpose of the ship's discipline, or if not, you expel the incorrigible party; but I think the analogy does not apply to education.

1600. Supposing I send a boy to be trained for the sea; that boy goes on board of a ship very young, and his education (although I do not use that word; I prefer the word "instruction") in the business by which he is afterwards to live is going on. During the whole course of that instruction he would have to be corrected for immoral acts, telling falsehoods, and so forth, just as much as if he were in a school; and it has to be done in all those situations effectually, and is done so, without these constant appeals to peculiar doctrinal religion. How do you explain that?—I think when you get beyond the period of schooling the case altogether alters; the discipline he must get as an apprentice appears to me quite another subject.

1601. Is there any distinction between a boy learning his duties on board of a ship, and another boy in a school learning arithmetic?—I think a great distinction.

The last attempt made to drive Mr. Hinton from his position was based on the avowedly partial character of the instruction given.

1603. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Do you bear in mind that these schools do not profess to educate, in the larger sense of the word, but to instruct within defined limits; does not that make a difference?—I think not; inasmuch as schools occupy the whole time, with the exception of the specified hours that the children are to spend in religious instruction; and I do not think that the school routine should have excluded from it the influence of religion.

1604. Supposing a boy training to some kind of art is sent to a school of design, would you object to that school of design that there was no religious instruction?—No, certainly not; but the thing which we have before us is peculiar and definite, that is, schools for the instruction of the working classes; and the question comes to be, whether it is expedient, or otherwise, that from the great bulk of the school routine for the working classes there should be an absence of the religious element.

1605. Is not the difference between these schools and the school of design simply one of degree, the school of design teaching one thing, and these schools teaching several things?—Yes, it is one of degree, but not of degree only. The schools for the working classes occupy the whole time to be spent in education, and take in, in point of fact, the whole of education; but on the subject of religion, you put into two hours, or a certain small time, the whole of religious instruction and influence, when I think in such cases it should be diffused through the whole school routine.

1606. But the school of design may leave the boy as few hours in the day for religious instruction as the other school?—He does not go to it until after his other education is finished; boys do not go to the school of design under 13 or 15 years old.

This extended cross-examination, it may be fairly said, shows the importance attached in the Committee to the opinion of Mr. Hinton, and the earnestness with which it was desired to draw damaging concessions from him; of the manner in which he maintained his ground we shall leave our readers to form their own judgment.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS EXPEDIENCY.

Before entering on the particular subject of this chapter, we shall present to the reader an important statement of the Rev. W. J. Kennedy, school inspector, confirmatory of the views we have already expressed. It was put in evidence by Mr. Hinton.

1609. Mr. Kennedy, I believe, expresses an opinion on this subject in accordance with your own?—He does, in his Report for 1851, an extract from which I beg to put in, in addition to the evidence he himself has given: "On the subject of religious instruction in schools, I am become very much impressed, from all I have seen, with a conviction that, owing to the claims on the time of the clergy among the adults of their flock, and the general work of their parishes, we must look very much to the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses as the religious teachers of the youthful poor: and with the youthful poor their religious knowledge and impressions are to be obtained in the school, or nowhere; it is worse than useless to look to their homes. I am equally convinced that all the religious knowledge they ought to acquire, to say nothing of religious impressions, cannot be imparted in the Sunday school. About the correctness of these remarks my observation leads me to entertain no doubt, and I am induced to make them, owing to the views which are now being sedulously promulgated by the 'National (formerly the 'Lancashire') Public School Association.' The supporters of those views, though perhaps equally desirous with myself of bringing up children religiously, think that the elementary schools for the poor should be purely secular; and my object is to show that they are mistaken in supposing that the children of the working classes can be trained religiously, as a body, unless the masters and mistresses of schools be teachers of religion. I am compelled to admit, from attentive observation, that in many schools there is no great amount of religious knowledge imparted, owing to the number of subjects which the scholars of elementary schools have to learn in a short space of time. But I have also observed, at least I think I have, that even in some of the schools where the children could not answer many questions on religious subjects, the piety of the teacher, as shown in his character and demeanour, and in the religious remarks which he from time to time had opportunities of making, produced

the most beneficial effects, such as would make me greatly regret to see schools where the teacher was bound by law to hold his tongue on such subjects."

As Mr. Kennedy was himself in attendance on the Committee, our notice of his evidence will properly find a place here. His entire evidence, as may be inferred from the preceding paragraph, is adverse to the secular scheme, a fact to which the public will justly attach great weight. His first objections to it are derived from its incompatibility with the existing school system, and its repugnance to public feeling.

1349. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—If you were obliged to establish a school in a district where no local subscriptions were raised, on what religious principle would you establish the school ?—I cannot give an answer at once to that question easily. I may certainly answer the question so far as to say that if it is a question between no school and what is called a secular school, I am most decidedly in favour of a secular school. But as a national system I think the "secular" scheme, on two main grounds, besides others, unwise and impracticable. One is, that you could not upset the existing schools, and, therefore, it never could become a national system ; and, in the next place, I think that if the attempt were made, the feeling of the country at large, in which I have had some considerable experience, is very much against it, and that all would work against it, and work towards the religious system, namely, the schools connected with the religious congregations.

1350. Do you believe if such a district as the question referred to were pointed out, that some religious body would step in to supply the deficiency of subscriptions which would entitle them to the support of Government ?—Yes, I think eventually that will get itself done everywhere, though not so fast as I could wish, certainly.

1351. *Chairman.*—When you spoke of upsetting the present system, might it not be possible to give assistance to the present system of denominational schools upon certain conditions, namely, that if they received the assistance of a rate, they should separate the religious from the secular instruction, and merely be paid for the secular instruction which they afford pupils ?—I will not say that it would be *impossible*, but I have never seen any plan suggested for it which I thought would work.

1356. *Mr. Miles.*—If the secular system had been taken up by the country as the best system, do you not conceive that a number of schools would have been scattered throughout the country founded upon that system ?—If it had been generally taken up, no doubt; originally no schools emanated from any such view of the question ; all the schools emanated from a religious feeling.

1357. Consequently, if we have now comparatively few, or almost none, of the schools established on the secular system, have we not reason to believe that what is called the denominational system has taken hold of the affections of the people of England ?—Undoubtedly ; unquestionably.

Mr. Kennedy next adverted to a highly important topic, the influence of the secular scheme on the supply of school teachers.

1372. *Chairman.*—Do you see any objection now, in the country parishes, to separating the religious from the secular instruction, so that the day schools should be considered as strictly secular, but that, at the same time, the clergyman should have it in his power, and should have time and place allotted for attention to the religious instruction of the children ?—I think that if we could avoid that we shall be doing well. I may mention, among other reasons,—the reasons would be very numerous if I had to give an opinion in writing,—one is the race of masters, and where those masters are to be trained.

1373. I am speaking of the country parishes, where you have resident clergymen ?—How are such schools to be furnished with masters ? how is the master to be trained ? Is he to have no religious opinions ? because that, I should apprehend, would be the best kind of master for such a school.

At an early period of the inquiry, a reference of a very different character had been made to the same subject by Dr. M'Kerrow, who could imagine no reason why a religious schoolmaster should object to conduct a secular school but this, that "he was not permitted to teach all the doctrines he believed." This curt and unsatisfactory observation, however, was far from laying the subject to rest. In the paper supplementary to the evidence of Mr. Hinton it is thus again noticed—

The adverse influence of nationalising the secular scheme on the supply of school teachers having been referred to, Dr. M'Kerrow strongly expressed his opinion that no such influence would be exercised by it. I cannot by any means agree with him. Certainly no really religious teacher could execute his office under the restrictions of the secular system without great pain and difficulty, if at all; not, as intimated by Dr. M'Kerrow, "because he was not permitted to teach all the doctrines he believed," but because he was not permitted to teach the cardinal truths, and to apply the great motives of Christianity. His own feelings would be constantly impelling him to make religious appeals, and he would be conscious that in studiously omitting them, he was omitting the most powerful elements of moral discipline. Pious men and women who are now, in many cases, attracted to the scholastic profession as one presenting a sphere of great usefulness, would, under such circumstances, in all probability retire from it, and abandon the education of the working classes to persons who had either no more religion than the system they had to work, or not conscientiousness enough to act upon it; an issue than which nothing more calamitous for the country can be conceived.

The importance of this topic has been clearly perceived by the Rev. W. J. Kennedy, school inspector, who, in his Report for 1851, thus writes:—"The one great reason which I think should be an insuperable bar to the adoption in England of the purely secular school system, is the difference which would inevitably (I think) result in the description of teachers of schools. What kind of persons, in education and character, would be the teachers of schools on a rigidly enforced secular plan? The answer to this question seems all-important. I have no hesitation in stating, that I have observed in many cases how wide is the difference between the character and tone of the scholars and apprentices of a really religious teacher and those of a 'secular' teacher, I mean of one who is devoted to secular learning, with an absence of religious zeal and feeling. And, though I would not venture to say that the teacher of a purely secular school must necessarily be personally wanting in religion, I entertain strong fears that such would be the result of a purely secular system of schools. The training of such a teacher would not, as at present, necessarily involve any religious training, and he would not feel any godly jealousy of the sanctity attaching to his vocation, such as I believe is often felt among our present teachers. Again, on the secular plan we could never look to have persons entering the profession of teachers from religious zeal; whereas now many of the most valuable teachers have, I know, espoused that calling because they are allowed and expected to be teachers of religion as well as of general knowledge. The loss to schools of such teachers would be great."—Minutes, 1852, vol. ii., p. 351.—*Appendix*, p. 239.

Mr. Salter is afterwards examined on this point in the following manner.

1838. *Sir G. Grey.*—Suppose you were appointed to take charge of a school, with the direction that you were to give nothing but secular instruction to those children, and abstain from all religious teaching, could you conduct that school on the same principles upon which you conduct your own school after ten in the morning?—No. In the first place, I should have this objection in entering on it: I should feel degraded into a mere educational policeman; I should be giving secular instruction for an object certainly good in itself, so far as it goes, but for no better purpose, as regards the serving of society, than does the grocer who sells his sugar across the counter. There is so much in

the office of teacher to try one, that one needs a little enthusiasm to carry out the work ; and if you deprive the teacher of this, you will not have the sort of teacher that is requisite to work upon the very lowest classes. Therefore, the strong objection which teachers usually feel to the secular plan is this, that it will be likely to deprive them of this power ; they will be shorn of this particular influence : it is not that you can measure it by any form of words, but they possess it, and if you make such a law as shall deprive them of the exercise of it, then they are, in the same sense as the grocer, engaged in selling an article by which they get their money, and there is an end of it.

Mr. Kennedy further adverted to the importance of early religious instruction to children, and the possibility of its being imparted by the clergy.

1376. *Chairman.*—You think there would be strong objection in the country to the establishment of secular schools ; would not that objection be in some measure removed, by it being considered that there is already set apart for religious instruction in this country very large funds ; and in respect to the teaching the children the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, surely as far as the rural parishes are concerned, the clergyman of every parish might, consistently with his other duties, devote some portion of his time to that ?—I do not think that the religious instruction of the children in the schools should rest on the clergyman ; I think it must devolve upon the master, if it is to be done properly ; that we must have a body of masters who can do it. I think the clergyman has other duties to attend to, which prevent him doing that efficiently.

1377. Do you really consider that there should be a positive course of theology gone through by small children in rural parishes ; is it not sufficient to give them general views, and to impress them with the solemnity of their faith, without trying to teach little children difficult doctrines ?—It comes to be rather an important question which you have asked me, because it touches on the basis of all belief. Belief is a much more intuitive thing than is commonly supposed. I think that it should be inculcated in early childhood ; that not only the subjective, but also the objective truths of religion, to a great extent, are intuitive, and that we cannot teach them too early. I do not say that they are innate in the mind, but I believe that they are connate, and grow up with the mind, and that you cannot teach them too early.

1333. You spoke of religious instruction as being a very valuable part of education in those schools : what sort of religious instruction ; do you refer to any particular form ?—I should think that the absence of any religious instruction, and the not being allowed to give it, would be particularly objectionable, and a very great pity.

1334. Do you speak of religious instruction generally ?—Where the master's tongue is restricted on such subjects, and he is not able to speak on them, he is often prevented from doing a vast amount of good, therefore I should be sorry to see any such restriction put.

The opinion of Mr. Horner, which seems to have been partially misunderstood by Mr. Bazley, is quite in unison with that of Mr. Kennedy. Speaking of schools for the working classes he says—

1454. I have always been of opinion that religious training was an essential part of the education of that class of children, and that if they did not get it in schools, I did not know where else they could get it.

In the course of the proceedings frequent reference was made to the schools on the national system in Ireland, as exemplifying that combination of secular with unsectarian religious instruction which is intended by the advocates of the Secular scheme. We do not think enough is known of the Irish system, or that, according to what is known, the working of it is sufficiently satisfactory, to give much force to this illustration. In order

to show how easily the religion common to all sects might be imparted by teachers of any, Mr. Fox put the following question to Mr. Kennedy.

1374. *Mr. W. Fox.*—It is stated in the Irish reports, that in some of the schools the master is a Roman-catholic, one teacher is an Episcopalian, and another teacher is a Presbyterian, and these several teachers take charge of the religious instruction of the united Irish ; would that be impracticable in England ?—It would be a curious happy family mixed up.

1375. Are you aware that it exists in many schools in Ireland ? Perhaps in some of the large schools ; I do not think it is the best possible plan.

And speaking to a preceding question, the same gentleman uses the following language.

1349. In Ireland, where, under the most favourable circumstances, an attempt was made to get what are termed mixed schools, even these [schools] have worked towards an exclusive system. Where the master was a Roman-catholic, and there was a very large majority of Roman-catholics attending the school, Protestants in very many cases there leave off, and do not attend the school at all, and a separate school is established by the Protestant rector of the parish ; and so on the other hand, where there is a majority of Protestants attending the school, and there is a Protestant master, then the Roman-catholics are dissatisfied, and set up other schools. If that so works in Ireland, as I believe it does to a great extent, it would be still more so in this country.

We may now adduce the opinion of Mr. Hinton, as thus compactly expressed. On the supposition of the greatest possible efficiency which can be attributed to the extra-scholastic instruction, he pronounces the plan of detaching religious from secular instruction to be highly unsatisfactory, for the following reasons :—

1534. First, because religion is too important to the youthful mind, especially to that large portion of the population who learn religion at school or nowhere, for so valuable an opportunity of imparting it to be lost. Secondly, because the training of the youthful mind in school hours could not in this way be effectively conducted, since a religious influence must be required at all times as an element of discipline and moral culture. Thirdly, because the studied exclusion of religion from school hours would be powerfully counteractive of religious instruction out of them. Speaking of religious instruction in schools, the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth uses the following just and powerful language : "If this is a truth, it ought to be uttered ; and if not uttered, it will be supposed not to be true. There is atheism in his silence. And what will be the result ? The pupil will either abhor his teacher as a deceiver, or else disbelieve Christianity. There is no security against such a result as this, in consigning him to chance instruction in religion for a few hours in the week. If the instruction of these few hours convince him that Christianity is true, it will convince him that Christianity, being true, ought to be taught in his school, and ought to be the basis of education. Hence, either the religion of the Church and the home will make him despise and hate the teaching of the school ; or the irreligion of the school will counteract the religion of the Church and the home." (Occasional Sermons, No. 19, p. 49.) Fourthly, because the large proportion of time and attention given to secular instruction would give the prevailing character to education, in defiance of the amount of religious instruction allowed to be incidental to it.

To this we may add the valuable testimony of the Rev. W. J. Unwin, principal of the Congregational training school, who thus develops the ideas entertained by that body on the character of the religious element in education.

Religious Education.—This is effected by the exposition of Scripture truth, by the maintenance of a religious tone in the operations of the school,

and by an increasing care to give strength to the convictions of conscience, and so nourish devout feeling.

In regard to the character of the teaching, it ought not to be so general as not to involve the distinctive truths of revelation. No satisfaction can be afforded by vague generalities. It is positive truth alone that is adapted to the necessities of our nature. To practise any reserve in reference to what is vital in Christianity, is to give the children a stone when they ask for bread.

On the other hand, religious instruction should involve no denominational peculiarities. . . .

Besides the direct religious teaching of the school, you have large opportunities of influencing the minds of your youthful charge by indirect means. The value of this cannot be exaggerated, and a faithful teacher will, in connection with all pursuits, keep in view the culture of the moral affections and religious susceptibilities. The growth or decline of our powers depends upon a fixed law. They grow by exercise, and they lose tone and vigour by inaction. This is no less true of the moral, than of the physical and intellectual part of our nature. The question, then, is all-important—by what means can these be properly exercised? Surely, by the employment of right motives ; and in the education of the young it is not too much to say, that motives are everything. Now, in the school-room and in the play-ground, character is perpetually forming for good or evil ; at all times and in connection with all duties, manifold occasions occur for exercising the moral faculties by the presentation of proper motives, and therefore secular and religious education, like the warp and the woof, must go together, and no opportunity of appealing to the conscience of a child be neglected. Never stimulate to the performance of actions externally right by motives intrinsically wrong. A child thus influenced will become morally diseased. As Christians, alive to your responsibility to God, you cannot make use of inferior means when more powerful are within your reach, or dispense with the stronger and the right motive, and have recourse to the weaker and the wrong ; but you will desiderate that conscience should prompt to duty ; and the 'fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom,' be the mainspring of action.—*Appendix*, p. 249.

With such a view—and we confess we think it a just view—of the position of the religious element in education, it is clear that the extrusion of it from the school routine must be to the last degree pernicious.

But let us now attend to what may be said in vindication of such a course.

As a fair and somewhat amusing example of the elaborate hits beside the mark with which the evidence of Dr. M'Kerrow abounds, we cite the following rather long, but highly characteristic passage.

343. *Chairman.*—Is it your object in making this statement to show that doctrinal or religious instruction may with propriety, in the public school and elsewhere, be kept separate and distinct from the communication of secular instruction ?—It is ; and I would endeavour further to confirm this opinion by the following arguments :—First, the essential union of the secular and theological in education is not taught either in Scripture or reason. I can nowhere learn from such authorities that lessons in reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography must be interspersed with remarks on theology, or even on ethics: neither can I discover that it is absolutely requisite that any of the doctrines of Christianity should be taught always between the hours of nine and twelve, or two and four o'clock of each day, and in connexion with common secular instruction. Secondly, to maintain that the secular and the religious should never be dissevered in carrying on instruction at a particular time, seems to lead us to the conclusion, that all books which children read should display the union, to which such importance is attached by some ; that no work of history, geography, or amusement should be put into the hands of a child unless interspersed with moral and religious reflections. A child, after the lapse of a few months, begins to learn more from books than from the schoolmaster. I cannot, therefore see

why the people, who oppose the separation of the religious from the secular in public schools, should not also insist that all children's books should exhibit the union referred to, and seek to secure it by establishing a censorship of the press. But one book gives secular and another religious instruction, and they are read at different times. I am of opinion that secular instruction may be given at one time by one person, and religious instruction at another time by another person. Thirdly, to insist that secular instruction may not be given without the accompaniment of religious is to limit the sphere of usefulness and narrow immensely the field of human improvement, and is virtually to declare that we should permit no good to be done unless we are allowed to do all that we desire ; is to refuse, for example, to communicate any kind of useful knowledge to the millions of people in India, and to promote their social welfare, because they refuse to receive our Christianity along with the secular instruction, the benefit of which they appreciate and are anxious to obtain. Fourthly, to blend the secular and the denominationally religious in the teachings of a school supported by public taxation would be unjust, contrary to the rights of conscience, and injurious to religion. To select and teach the creed of one religious party would be to inflict a wrong on all other parties, which are equally entitled to determine for themselves what is truth ; and to endow all religious opinions and modes of worship is, in my opinion, to place truth and the manifold forms of error and superstition on the same footing, and, indeed, to obstruct the former and encourage the latter, and thus to excite the resistance of the conscientious who desire for the propagation of all religious opinions only a fair field and no favour. Fifthly, the union of the secular and specially religious is not considered to be necessary in many of the private schools which are attended by the children of the middle and higher classes, nor in classical schools, which are frequented in perhaps the most important period of life in which education can be received, and where religious zeal does not consider it to be requisite to counteract by doctrinal teaching the errors even of heathen mythology ; nor in mechanics' institutions, nor in schools of design, nor in universities. Lastly, the blending of secular and creedal instruction is impracticable in common schools, where children of various denominations meet together. The pupils and teachers must all belong to the same sect where mixed instruction is attempted, otherwise explanations during the course of the lessons given would render necessary for the protection of conscience the frequent or the entire removal of some children, even from the secular advantages to which they are entitled, and thus constant change and disorder would ensue. But if, in order to prevent injustice or confusion, a special time were chosen for the scriptural or religious instruction of those children whose parents were desirous that they should receive it, then the separation is conceded which constitutes the basis of the plan of the National Public School Association.

To this Mr. Hinton replies in the following terms :—

1532. Have you noticed the reasons assigned by Dr. M'Kerrow (343) for the separation of secular from religious instruction ?—I have, and without being convinced by them. The first reason is, that the essential union of the secular and the theological in education is not taught either in Scripture or reason ; nor, I may add, by any other authority that I ever heard of. The whole question is one of expediency. We ask simply, is it expedient in promoting the education of the working classes, to adopt a system which shall to so great an extent detach the formation of early character from the great motives supplied by religious truth ? His second reason is, that upon this principle " all children's books" should be religious ; but as I do not hold the principle, I am not bound by the conclusion. " Thirdly," says Dr. M'Kerrow, " to insist that secular instruction may not be given without the accompaniment of religious, is to limit the sphere of usefulness." But I do not insist on any such thing generally ; I am quite willing that professors should still teach French, music, and drawing in a style absolutely secular ; nor have I any insuperable objection to the Hindoo College at Calcutta. I only think that in a system of national schools for the working classes of England, moral culture should not be deprived

of the religious power. "Fourthly," the Doctor proceeds, "to blend the secular and the denominationally religious in the teachings of a school supported by taxation would be unjust." Clearly; and therefore I am for having no school supported by taxation. In the fifth place, Dr. M'Kerrow refers to schools for the middle and higher classes and public institutions, in respect of which no such "religious zeal" is shown; but in all these cases attendance is voluntary and determined by parents, who are the proper parties to judge. With the voluntary action of the poor I would no more interfere than with that of the rich; but when the question is, what shall be the character of a great system, founded by the Legislature and supported by taxation, for the working classes generally, my opinion of what is most expedient in this particular case comes into proper bearing. Lastly, Dr. M'Kerrow tells us that "the blending of secular and creedal instruction is impossible in common schools." Very true; then let us have no common schools, but employ ourselves in encouraging parents universally to educate their own children, each in his own way.

To this Mr. Hinton might have added, that the question, which was, of course, framed by Dr. M'Kerrow to suit his intended answer, contains the primary aberration of thought. It inquires into the propriety of keeping religious and secular instruction separate "in the public school and elsewhere." "In the public school *and elsewhere?*" Why, no creature, be he voluntary or otherwise, has ever dreamt of requiring the union of religious and secular instruction universally. Their connection in public schools is all that has ever been under discussion. But, to use a familiar illustration, Dr. M'Kerrow must not be hanged for keeping to the point, for verily he is not guilty.

In answer to Q. 573, Dr. Watts assigns his reasons why "doctrinal religion should not be included in the public school." The first of these reasons we have already considered; here are the second and third—

573. The second reason is, because the Government is interested only in the well-being of society, which well-being, if it depends on religious teaching, depends not on the differential doctrines of the sects, but upon so much as meets with general acceptance. . . . The third reason is, because, as members of society, we are interested only in the performance of the social duties.

"As members of society," says Dr. Watts, "we are interested solely in the performance of the social duties." True; but, as undertaking the education of children, we are *in loco parentis*, and are consequently interested in their entire destiny; and we have no right to thrust out of so large a part of their culture as is constituted by the school routine the religious element in its most energetic form. As educators we are more than citizens; we are virtually parents, and should do nothing less than a parent's duty. Taking Dr. Watts's own position, that "government is interested only in the well-being of society," we draw a direct argument from it that government ought not to educate, since it cannot enter into the true scope of education, which is the whole well-being of the man.

"If the well-being of society," says Dr. Watts again, "depends on religious teaching," then it depends "not on the differential doctrines of the sects." Perhaps so; but who told Dr. Watts that "the well-being of society depends on religious teaching?" All that we are responsible for is the assertion that the well-being of *the man* depends on religious character; from whence we infer that education, which ought to regard the well-being of the man, ought to comprehend religious instruction and culture. Doubtless, what promotes man's whole well-being will be found beneficial for society as well as the individual.

Dr. Watts closes his reply to this question with the following extract from Mr. Herbert Spencer, by which he amusingly thinks his argument very much strengthened :—

" Creeds pasted on the memory, good principles learned by rote, lessons in right and wrong, will not eradicate vicious propensities. Whatever moral benefit can be effected by education must be effected by an education which is emotional rather than preceptive.* If, in place of making a child understand that this thing is right and the other wrong, you make it feel that they are so—if you make virtue loved, and vice loathed—if you rouse a noble desire, and make torpid an inferior one—if you bring into life a previously dormant sentiment—if you cause a sympathetic impulse to get the better of one that is selfish—if, in short, you produce a state of mind to which proper behaviour is natural, spontaneous, instinctive—you do some good ; but no drilling in catechisms, no teaching of moral codes, can effect this. Only by repeatedly awakening the appropriate emotions can character be changed." And this emotional teaching (adds Dr. Watts), I would remark, seems to me much more possible by means of anecdotes showing how the performance of kindly actions begets a return of kindness, and how self-reliance, and persevering industry, and high morality, are sure ultimately to be appreciated, than by any other means.

Now, we beg Dr. Watts to observe that we are no advocates for " drilling in catechisms," or " teaching of moral codes." We quite believe with Mr. Spencer, that " whatever moral good can be effected by education, must be effected by an education which is emotional, not preceptive." Herein, however, *we* find a decisive condemnation of the secular system, the moral part of which Dr. M'Kerrow first states is to consist of precepts without any motives, and which both he and Dr. Watts tell us is to allow of no motives but such as may be drawn from the being and providence of God. These gentlemen call out for motives, and yet exclude Christianity ! They are for reciting touching " anecdotes," but will never breathe to the children the heart-stirring fact, that " God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The palpable neglect of motives by the secular system is thus animadverted on by Mr. Hinton.

It is true that the secular system proposes to inculcate the moral virtues ; but, on the other hand, it prohibits the use, if not of all the motives, yet of the principal motives by which they can be created and sustained, and so reduces its moral instruction to the lowest possible value. Dr. M'Kerrow distinctly says (493), " All we have to do is to reprove the sin or to teach the duty ;" " the motive," he adds, " would be furnished elsewhere." In answer 496, he inconsistently admits the use of motives drawn from the authority of God and future responsibility, but expressly asserts (495), that " no Christian motive to action should be inculcated ;" and yet he thinks " that the moral precepts would convey their moral influence" (493). For my own part, I think that precept without motive is utterly powerless, and that all moral precepts require to be enforced by the strongest motives applicable to them.—*Appendix*, p. 239.

Dr. Watts loves to amuse himself with irrelevant answers. Take the following as an example :—

887. It has been objected, sometimes in my hearing, that the shutting out of doctrinal teaching from the day schools would make religion appear an inferior thing. I think, if there is any force in this reasoning, it ought to follow that the religious teaching on Sunday should appear quite an inferior thing, and should be universally rejected, separated as it is from all secular duties [teaching].

* Misprinted *perceptive*.

As if he thought that the inferiority of religion was to appear in the mere fact of its being taught apart, as in a Sunday school, which is only an auxiliary to education, and the exclusively religious character of which is obviously prescribed by the day on which it is held; and did not perceive that the exclusion of religion from the day-school was its exclusion where nothing prescribed it, and from the entire course of education itself.

At another time, he causes himself to be asked the following question.

866. *Chairman.*—It has been urged that there is no sanction for morality apart from religion, and that is an objection to your system?

We can only conjecture that in this question a reference was intended to one which had been previously put to the same witness by Mr. Bowyer, in the following terms.

623. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Are you aware that the Church of England considers all morality, right and wrong, to spring from faith, and from Divine influence?

This question, it is evident, is infelicitously expressed, perhaps incorrectly reported. To the supposed assertion "that there is no sanction for morality apart from religion," Dr. Watts answers that this cannot be affirmed of Christianity, or revealed religion; which is true, since natural religion also contains sanctions for morality. He adds, however, that "the first sanction for morality is experience, and the second religion." Without stopping to criticize this philosophy, we may ask why, even if it were so, Dr. Watts need have imagined an objection to his system, since he means to teach natural religion, and to enforce morals by sanctions derived from it?

On the expediency and influence of separating secular from religious instruction, the cross-examination of Dr. Watts was long and searching. As it does not contain much matter of importance, and as the insertion of the whole of it would too greatly enlarge the bulk of this pamphlet, we present a few characteristic extracts.

875. *Mr. Miles.*—What do you mean by the last part of your answer, "So much of religion as the sects agree upon;" what is the quantity and what the quality of it?—I cannot draw the exact line; but there would be no practical difficulty in the matter; for instance, the schoolmaster would, in his common teaching, allude frequently to the Deity; and he would allude to the providence of God, and to the pleasure of God in good conduct.

876. But would he, at the same time, in his teaching, refer to the Mediator between God and man?—He would require to be very careful upon that point, because Unitarians have particular convictions. He would refer, doubtless, to Jesus Christ as setting the highest possible example, and would strive to get the children to imitate the conduct of Christ; and he would exhibit so much of it in his own conduct as possible, in order to set them an example.

877. But still, in deference to what forms but a small section of the community, would you do away with the Divine attributes of the Saviour in teaching?—In general day-school teaching I would.

905. *Mr Bowyer.*—Supposing, now in the course of the Scripture reading, the name of Christ occurred to the child of a Unitarian, and the child asked the master, "Who is Christ?" what could he answer?—The reply would be to refer him to the book to read for himself.

906. The book would merely name Our Lord; the Unitarian child would say, who was he?—And the Unitarian minister would reply, "He was the Son of God."

907. What would the teacher or the master say?—It would depend on the circumstances of the case what would be the master's reply, and upon his idea of the object of asking; he might indeed not give a definite reply at all, but

refer the child to his religious teacher ; and I think that would be very effective, because the child's curiosity would be awakened, and the religious teacher would the more easily satisfy that curiosity.

908. Would there not be great inconvenience in the master refusing to answer a question of that sort ?—I think not ; every parent is obliged frequently to refuse to answer questions by his children.

909. *Mr. Miles.*—But still, on so vital a point as that of religion, if a question emanates from a child, should not that child have an answer ?—Of course he should ; but it does not follow that he should be then answered immediately, by an individual not engaged for the purpose.

910. Would it not be letting down the teacher in the eyes of that child, if he were to say, " No, I cannot give an answer, but go to your religious preceptor, and get an answer from him " ?—If he were to put it in those words, possibly it might : but if he were to tell the child, " The hour for religious teaching is so and so, and I hope you will bring up that question to your religious teacher, and he will give you interesting information upon that subject," the curiosity of the child would be awakened, the teacher would mind his own business, and the child would get much better taught.

911. Then, in reading the Bible you would not put parallel passages together at all, would you ?—I think not.

912. Nor would you endeavour to explain one text of Scripture by another, if the child were to ask, what is the meaning of that ?—Not ordinarily ; I should in such cases refer the child to his religious teacher.

913. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Supposing the expression in a text of Scripture, " The Son of God ; " and the child said, " What does that mean ? "—The reply might be, " There will be a lesson upon that subject after the close of the hours of instruction. I shall be much obliged if you will remind me of that question then ; in the presence of other children, who do not attend the religious teaching of this school, I cannot enter upon it."

914. Would not that seem very strange to the child ?—Not stranger than many other things do. My child very frequently puts questions to me, and my reply is, " I cannot answer that question until you get older, and are better able to understand me."

915. But you would not refuse to answer a child's question upon a point of that sort, involving a vital point of religion ?—I should, certainly, as a day-school teacher.

916. As a parent ?—As a parent I should refuse to answer it, unless I thought the child could properly comprehend the answer.

917. Take the case that he could properly comprehend the answer ?—Then I should answer it at once.

918. Then would it not be strange for a schoolmaster to refuse to answer that question ?—The child would soon get an idea what was the schoolmaster's proper duty, and he would not put such questions ; but he would bear them in mind, and put them to the religious teacher.

919. Then in point of fact, the child could not have any explanation of any matter occurring in the Scripture lesson ?—He could only get answers upon moral precepts, or upon history.

921. Do you think that the Bible was ever meant to be used in that exclusive manner for teaching morality ?—That is a question I cannot answer at all.

922. Have you ever formed an opinion upon that question ?—I have no doubt that the Bible was meant to be used for every good purpose it is capable of ; but those purposes depend upon the people who use it.

923. Do you think that the Bible was ever meant to be used in such a manner as to leave out all religion ?—My impression is, that the Bible may be used for every good purpose as every other book, and that it may be used partially or wholly as suits the conviction and the convenience of the teacher.

924. Do you think when we find a number of truths given to us by God himself, that we have a right to separate those truths ?—We have a perfect right, I believe, to deal in accordance with our own conscience with whatever comes before us.

925. Would not many religious persons object to make that separation of things which God has put together?—It is utterly impossible to teach them all at once, therefore I do not see why they should.

926. The Gospel teaches religion and morality together, and morality as springing from religion; would you not infer from thence that it is not impossible to teach morality and religion together?—I should infer that it is quite possible to teach morality through religion, but I also know it to be quite possible to teach morality separately.

927. Do you mean to say that it is impossible to teach morality as arising from religion?—I have answered that question, by saying that it is possible to teach morality through religion.

928. Would you not infer that that was the intention with which the Bible was written?—My impression is, that if religion does not produce moral results, it is not a valuable religion.

929. Do you not think that it appears that the intention with which the Bible was written was, to teach morality with religion, and as springing out of religion?—I have no doubt that it was, inasmuch as I have already stated that the highest form of morality is seen under the Christian religion.

930. Do you not think that many religious persons would scruple to separate religion and morality?—I do not see why they should.

931. If God meant that they should be taught together?—I do not see why they should object to separate and teach as much as can be understood and maintained by all, and to supplement such teaching by that which is peculiar.

932. Do not you think that they would, in point of fact, object to that?—If they did, the objection of the Roman-catholic would be one, and the objection of the Protestant another; and I should want to know immediately in connexion with what form of religion I must teach morality; and every member of every sect would require his own form, and I should be set fast and could not teach it at all.

933. Do not you think that all sects of Christians, that certain Roman-catholics and members of the Established Church and Wesleyans, and also Baptists, would hold that religion ought not to be separated from morality?—I think I know members of all those sects who do not hold it.

934. Individuals may not do so, but is not that the opinion of the sects?—I am not sure that I am competent to form an opinion upon that subject; but the National Public School Association comprises members of all those bodies.

935. Do not you think that they, seeing that morality and religion were, in point of fact, taught together in the Bible, would object to taking the Bible to pieces and teaching one part separately?—I do not think they would; in practical life they do not.

936. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Do you think that the Bible, or any portion of it, was especially given to the world for the purpose of being used as an elementary school book?—My impression is, if I am to state my own individual opinion, that it is better not used as an elementary school book at all; and I think that the questions put by the honourable Member who last examined me are proof that the using of the Bible as an elementary school book would lead to amazing difficulty.

937. *Mr. Bowyer.*—That is as an elementary school book for secular knowledge?—I mean as an elementary school book at all in a mixed school.

938. Are there not many passages in the Scriptures which would be totally unintelligible without some explanation, involving at least the doctrines of Christianity as contradistinguished from some sects?—There are; and that shows the necessity of the separate teaching of such doctrines.

939. Then, in point of fact, you would be obliged to exclude the Bible altogether from your schools?—No, not altogether; we could * make the full use of it which any one sect did not object to.

Leaving these extracts generally to make their own impression, we shall merely observe that we do not differ at all from Dr. Watts's opinion of the

* Misprinted, *could not make.*

inexpediency of making the bible an elementary school book in a school which is not to be Christian. We agree with him in thinking that it "would lead to amazing difficulty." Our requirement for public schools is, that they should be Christian schools; schools in which shall be taught, and enforced for moral culture, the fundamental and characteristic truths of Christianity, apart from the peculiarities of Christian sects. As Christians we cannot lend our aid to any thing short of it.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE SECULAR SCHEME—ITS EXPEDIENCY CONTINUED.

One of the main positions on which the conclusion rests, that in education secular and religious instruction may very well be divided, is that they have distinct and separable aspects towards human wellbeing; that religious teaching is designed to prepare us for the future world, while secular teaching is fully adequate to prepare us for the present world. In the course of his examination this important point was taken up by Mr. Hinton.

1529. *Chairman.*—Your main object in giving religious instruction to children is, is it not, to prepare them for another world, and to promote the salvation of their souls?—In education this is not the main object with which religious instruction is employed; but it is used as an auxiliary to the training requisite to temporal happiness. Wellbeing in this world requires not merely knowledge but virtue, and the topics included in religious instruction supply not only strong motives, but the strongest of all motives to the practice of virtue. In his arduous task the conductor of moral discipline among children cannot, I believe, spare these motives. Admitting all that can be claimed for the force of habit, and the lessons of experience, I have no faith in the possibility of rearing a virtuous population by expounding the laws of nature, and calling them laws of God. For the sake of securing the very ends which secular educationists profess to desire, I would bring in the aid of religious instruction. And in no department of education is a truly religious influence more important, or its importance more generally acknowledged, than in that of the criminal classes by means of industrial schools, towards which the secular scheme particularly looks.

1530. You do not think, then, that the preparation for the two worlds, the present and the future, is so distinct that they can properly be carried on separately?—I am sure they cannot. It is a striking but certain peculiarity of this case, that the best preparation for the future world constitutes also the best preparation for the present. So obvious has the fallacy of the distinction between religious and secular instruction appeared to many reflecting men, that the Rev. J. P. Norris, in his Report for 1850, speaks of it in the following terms: "I rejoice to think that I may discard the once common distinction of education into secular and religious, as now exploded. It was false in theory, because as surely as school children are growing up into men, so surely are they growing up into religious or irreligious men; and whether into religious or irreligious men depends upon the religious or irreligious character of their education. To say that education can be neither religious nor yet irreligious, is therefore false; and, consequently, to say that a school can be merely secular, and in respect of religion neutral, that is, neither religious nor irreligious, is also false."—*Minutes,* 1851.

Mr. Hinton thus arrives at a satisfactory answer to a question by which

Dr. M'Kerrow (340, 342) was most unfortunately perplexed, supposing it to mean almost every thing it did not.

1531. Do you maintain the general proposition that education should be founded on a religious basis?—Meaning by this phrase, by which Dr. M'Kerrow was so unfortunately perplexed, and which certainly is somewhat vague, that the formation of moral character should not be attempted apart from the leading truths and motives of religion, I do.

We proceed now to give the more important parts of the evidence tendered by Messrs. Hindshaw and Salter, the deputed Manchester schoolmasters.

Mr. Hindshaw, having described his Bible lesson and teaching of the Church Catechism, (the former a daily exercise occupying about three quarters of an hour,) is thus examined.

1734. *Chairman.*—And this religious instruction is given separately from the secular instruction, is it not?—There is specific religious instruction given at the time I have mentioned, but I do not restrict myself from giving religious instruction at any other period of the day; for example, I have had occasion to suspend the school business to give a religious lesson, when circumstances occurred which I considered a favourable opportunity for enforcing a religious lesson.

1745. Supposing the parent of a child, a Roman-catholic, were to apply to you, and were to say, "Now, I will pay you so much to allow my child to come from a quarter to ten in the morning, when the secular instruction begins, and to continue until it concludes," would there be any objection to your allowing that, or, if you did, would it interfere with the general management of the school?—I do not see that there is any objection to allowing that; it would so far interfere with the general management of the school, as to cause an unseemly interruption in coming in at a time when all are presumed to be assembled.

1746. To that extent it would?—Yes.

1747.—So far as the course of instruction was carried on after ten, it would not interfere at all, nor would it interfere with your giving the hour's religious instruction that preceded ten in the morning?—Such a child, if sent with a view to be absent during religious instruction, could not, under the present arrangements of our school, be sure to be exempt, because the clergyman frequently comes, and gives a religious lesson at any time of the day.

1760. *Mr. Miles.*—Besides the Church Catechism, you do inculcate the doctrines of the Church of England in every possible way you can during the course of your teaching?—Certainly.

1761. For instance, taking geography, have you not a great power there, in teaching geography, of inculcating lessons in Holy Scripture?—Yes, by reference to the various religions prevalent in different countries.

1762. Do you adopt that mode?—Yes.

1763. Do you then endeavour to draw a parallel between that religion which you teach and those religions, to show that the religions of other countries are palpably* false, and your own true?—I do make such comparisons.

1564. It is not only in the time stated by the Honourable Chairman that actual religious instruction is given, but you give religious instruction whenever you see an opportunity of inculcating it on your pupils. It is given in geography, is it not, or any other lessons you may be inculcating in which an opportunity exists for you to bring the children's minds towards religion?—I take advantage of such an opportunity whenever it occurs.

1765. Therefore it cannot be said that your religious teaching is entirely confined to this three quarters of an hour per day?—Certainly not.

1766. Do you think it necessary to inculcate religious opinions upon the

* Misprinted *possibly.*

minds of your pupils on every occasion when you have an opportunity of doing it?—Upon every occasion when I have an opportunity of doing it.

1767. Is the religious instruction so blended with the secular instruction in your school as to render it impossible to separate the religious from the secular? —It is not impossible altogether to separate it, but I think a teacher would be obliged to be uncomfortably on his guard if he was expected to refrain from giving religious instruction.

1782. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Reading, writing, and arithmetic, and such things, can be taught easily without religion, can they not?—They can be.

1783. Taking the case of history, do not you think that religious history is an important part of the history of the world?—Yes.

1784. Then if you undertook to teach general history to children, leaving out all the religious part, you would give a very imperfect idea of history?—Certainly.

1785. As to the history of England, when you came to the introduction of Christianity into this country, you would impress upon the minds of your pupils something about Christianity?—Certainly.

1786. If you taught it as a mere dry fact, do not you think that would be a very imperfect way of teaching the History of England?—Very imperfect.

1787. So with other facts which interest persons of particular religious opinions, such as the facts relating to Wickliffe; you would not think you were teaching history correctly, unless you said something about the doctrines taught by Wickliffe?—I should not.

1788. If you left that out you would teach history imperfectly?—Yes.

In the examination of Mr. Bazley, Mr. Bowyer entered into an argument of the same kind, but less successfully we think, in relation to the preparation of school books; see Q. 160 to 169.

The following extracts are from the examination of Mr. Salter.

1810. *Chairman.*—Is yours the plan of merely reading the Bible without note or comment, or do you go beyond that and teach the doctrines?—We teach nothing peculiar, no denominationalism, except that we teach Protestantism as distinct from Catholicism, although we have Catholic children there present.

1811. *Sir G. Grey.*—State what is the religious instruction you give to the children?—In the morning we have a Bible lesson, as it is termed.

1812. What is the nature of that?—This Bible lesson is mainly made up of the facts of Bible history. The teacher under all systems is certainly at liberty; there is no system that can be contrived which shall so fetter the teacher, unless you shut out religion from the scheme, as to prevent him giving his own bias or his own peculiar view to the children; he cannot help it; he must impress the children with his own view.

1813. *Chairman.*—How long does this Bible lesson last?—Twenty or twenty-five minutes.

1814. *Sir G. Grey.*—Does it consist of reading the Bible?—No; for instance I take a given period, say from the Creation to the Deluge, taking the leading facts that occurred during those 1600 years.

1815. Do you ask questions from the children on those facts?—Yes; if evil consequences arise from any given act as related in the Bible, a reference is made to the reason, and the lesson is drawn from that, and impressed on the children of the importance of taking care to act rightly.

1816. Do you include the New Testament in your Bible lessons?—Yes.

1817. Do you abstain from all reasoning on the doctrines of the Church as divulged in the New Testament?—We do not teach sectarianism; the difference between Baptists and Pædo-Baptists, for instance.

1818. *Mr. Bowyer.*—You teach Protestantism?—The foundation of my teaching is, that everybody has the right to think for himself. With reference to English history, this is the way I would teach it, and do teach it. A case occurs, Wickliffe's case or anybody else's case, in which persecution, that is, punishment of some sort, is applied to a party who holds given opinions. I do not take it

merely because it has been done by Catholics, but by anybody. I find that punishment is applied to a man because he holds certain opinions. Then I would say to a boy, to illustrate the folly of this, looking him steadily in the face, "You are are standing on your head." The boy looks astounded. "You are standing on your head; don't you believe it?" The boy answers, "No." I say, "Then I shall beat you till you do believe it." The boy thinks immediately, and I succeed in making him believe that I shall carry out the threat. The next thing is, how unjust this is to beat the boy for not believing a thing that is not true. What am I to do? I say then, "Have I not a right to beat you? I am your master, and you must believe what I tell you." The boy says, "But I cannot believe it." Then, I say, that is the very point I want to get at; in order to make you believe, it is no use thrashing you; I must prove it." A belief of a thing must depend on the proof; and no amount of physical oppression can alter mental conclusions. That applies to either Catholic or Protestant persecution.

1823. *Chairman.*—What you call religious instruction is all over by twenty minutes past nine?—Special technical religious instruction.

1824. There is nothing after twenty minutes past nine that all sects could not unite in receiving?—I believe so.

1825. A Jew could be there as well as a Christian?—Yes.

1826. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Do you never teach any points of history after that time?—Yes, we have a period lasting about half an hour.

1827. If you are teaching different events connected with the rise and progress of Christianity, should you not put it in such a shape, by way of instruction to the children, that the Jew would not agree with it?—I take care to guard myself from doing injustice to anybody in this way. After having endeavoured to give them what I believe to be the truth, I say in cases where I know there is a dispute, and fairly so, "This is my opinion, and I have given you reasons; you have a right to differ from me." I inculcate this independence of thought, not to believe it because I believe it, but to make it out for themselves.

1828. If there were a Jew present, should you impress upon the children the truth of Christianity in history?—Not upon my own authority.

1829. But by reasoning?—Yes.

1830. Should you not show, as often occurs in history, facts proving the moral and social improvements arising from Christianity?—Yes.

1831. Although there was a Jew present?—Yes, and consider it a fair challenge to the Jew to rebut by counter-statement.

1832. *Chairman.*—You merely make out what you believe to be true in religion by reasoning, mingled with such instruction as you might call secular instruction?—Yes.

1833. *Mr. W. Fox.*—You honestly endeavour, in this teaching, to separate the facts of history from your own opinions?—Yes, and from the dogmas of religion.

1834. *Chairman.*—Your object is to teach the facts?—Yes.

1835. So that a Christian might learn the history of the events connected with the Mohamedan religion?—Yes.

1836. And so that a Mahomedan might learn the historical events connected with the commencement of Christianity?—Yes; but with this difference, as regards effect: my bias would be clear in regard to the one and not to the other; and, notwithstanding all one can do to separate between mere fact, and reasoning, and dogma, there is from the teacher passing to the children an influence which he cannot separate from himself, and which they will receive; that is what I referred to when I said, that no system can be devised by which you can take out of the hands of the schoolmaster the power of giving religious instruction if he chooses.

1837. *Mr. Miles.*—That is, the religious dogmatic feelings of the teacher?—Yes.

We cannot say that we are satisfied with the description which these gentlemen gave of the religious instruction communicated in their schools,

and we are inclined to hope that they have not done justice to themselves. Perhaps the unwonted circumstances under which they spoke put their courage somewhat to the test; but we should have been much more gratified if they had declared it their object to produce by the grand motives which the gospel exhibits a thoroughly religious and virtuous character. We hope they do so, though they did not say so. In any case, if they do not, they are not masters whom we should place in charge of public schools, nor should we attach to such religious teaching as they have described any considerable religious value.

Mr. Salter was afterwards examined on the possibility and expediency of separating the religious and the secular.

1844. *Chairman.*—Would you have any objection to receive a child into your school for instruction, to commence after the religious instruction was concluded?—No, not at all.

1845. Are there any now who come after the religious instruction is over?—I never had a single application to me to refrain from giving it.

1846. Supposing, for instance, a Roman-catholic had an inclination, feeling that the secular instruction you gave in your school was extremely good, and that you were such an excellent master that he felt he should like his child to go to your school, and get that secular instruction from you there; do you see any objection to that child commencing after the Bible lesson was over?—No.

1847. Supposing, for instance, a portion of the rate was given to your school, on this condition, namely, that after twenty minutes past nine in the morning, any person who chose might be entitled to send his child to receive secular instruction, would such a proposal as that interfere with your school, or render it less a religious school than it now is?—I think not.

1848. That is the proposition of the National Public School Association, as far as regards existing schools; to that extent, therefore, you would not suppose their plan objectionable?—No.

1849. *Mr. Bowyer.*—You said, in answer to the Chairman, that you would not object to receive scholars who should not learn until after the technically religious part had concluded?—Yes.

1850. From what you said before, the children coming to the school after the technical religious instruction was concluded, would learn that portion of religion that you mingle with your secular teaching?—They would, unavoidably and unintentionally.

1851. Then there is no part of your teaching which is totally separated from religion?—Not specifically and ostensibly.

1852. Supposing you were required to teach nothing but secular knowledge at certain hours, to confine your religious instruction to what you call your technical religious teaching, and to leave religion out from morals and history, and other things with which you now mingle it, would not that injure the religious character of your school?—I do not think it would injure the religious character of the school as such, but it would interfere with the religious influence of the teacher.

1853. Would it not injure the teaching of your school, and make it less satisfactory than it is now?—Decidedly, I am of opinion it would; for instance, I could not make history half so applicable or telling on a class, if I were not permitted to make the kind of inference I have just referred to.

1854. Would you not make your historical teaching imperfect if you left out a portion of religion which comes fairly into secular history?—I think so.

1855. *Chairman.*—Still there would be no practical difficulty if it became your duty to teach history merely, as regarded facts and information of that kind, without influencing the mind in favour of any particular religion, and could you do it?—If it were the duty of the teacher to become a sort of chronological table, he could become so, although it would be an undignified position for him to occupy.

Of this perpetually recurring game at bowls (again apologizing for the illustration) Mr. Fox subsequently came in for a share.

1809. *Mr. Fox.*—You said it was impossible to teach history without religion at the same time ; by religion, did you there mean the exercise of a high moral judgment on the events and characters of history, or did you mean the interweaving of theological doctrine ?—The first, not the last mentioned. As I said before, I never teach specific sectarian doctrines except in the very broadest possible way, as Catholicism is distinguished from Protestantism.

1870. *Mr. Bowyer.*—Then you exclude one set of dogmata ?—I actually teach Catholicism in another sense, in the sense of teaching the facts of it, only it is quite clear to the children, and to everybody else, that I am not an advocate and teacher of it in the sense of a believer in it ; I make it known, but I do not teach it.

1871. *Chairman.*—You do not violate the consciences of the Roman-catholics ? —No, I carefully endeavour to guard against that.

1872. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Was what you meant by teaching religion in connexion with history any thing different from what the teacher would practise under what is called the secular school system ?—If it were the secular school system, I think the great objection to it would be at once removed from it.

1873. Does anybody seriously doubt that it would allow the teaching of history, with moral judgment on the events of character and history ?—There are parties who believe that if the term secular were introduced and used without a distinct definition, and a large definition too, the effect would be to shut them out from all power of teaching religion, because it would be a dangerous subject to meddle with ; and the teacher would never know how to guard himself, except by making an utter exclusion of it.

One more extract, and we have done.

1840. *Mr. Miles.*—My question was, whether the generality of children that were instructed in your schools, when they come first, whether they had received any religious moral training at home ?—I scarcely know how to answer that question ; there are some who have not, but the majority have received some amount of religious training at home ; I will not say exclusively at home ; elsewhere.

1841. Would you think it therefore safe, to bring up a child in the way he should go, totally to disconnect your teaching with religion, and to leave the child either to find at home, or at a school apart from yours, religious instruction, confining your own teaching to the secular instruction ?—No ; I think it would not be safe ; I think the effect would be to render religious instruction unfashionable ; there is another word I ought to use,—to put a stigma on religious teaching to some extent, and to give the impression, in the minds of the children especially, that religion was a thing not to be troubled about. In what other way could you justify totally excluding religion ?

1842. From the knowledge you must have of the parents of the children of this very large school, do you think they would rather go on with the instruction given to them in a denominational school than send their children to the secular schools for instruction, supposing secular schools adopted ?—I believe if secular schools, as such, were established, schools such as mine, for instance, would carry the day, speaking from my own knowledge of public feeling.

In concluding our notice of the examination of these schoolmasters, it is enough to say that the seculars, with all their ingenuity, gained nothing by them, as we believe they somewhat sorely felt. We understood at the time that a galling consciousness of this was the occasion of Messrs. Curtis and Cuffe being summoned to the rescue.

A determined attack was made by the Seculars upon Mr. Toole, who, however, defended his position with great firmness and skill. The Chair-

man seems to have thought him worth his best efforts. The battle went as follows:—

1179. *Mr. Cobden.*—Then, in case of a rate for the support of Roman-catholic schools, you would still leave the clergymen of that denomination to afford the spiritual consolation which they now do, and without any aid from that rate?—It would be his duty to do so.

1180. Would it not then be possible so far to separate the religious from the secular teaching, as to confine the schoolmaster in the schools to that kind of instruction to which neither a Quaker, nor an Independent, nor a Baptist could object on conscientious grounds, and give to the children religious instruction through their spiritual teachers, as they do now?—I do not think it would.

1191. *Chairman.*—Supposing you said that you would supplement by the priests the religious part of the education, leaving it to the different religious bodies, and knowing it was not provided for in the day school, leaving it to their zeal in the cause to supplement this religious element of the education; would not such a plan as that be practicable, and meet the difficulties?—I think not; in the first place, it would not be practicable with us, for not having a school to aid in the teaching, it would be impossible for us, with our numbers, to devote the time to it in the number of schools. If the children could be brought altogether into one school, it might be; it could not otherwise be. In addition to that, the very profession of it makes religion something separate, as it were, from the ordinary business of life; whereas I hold that one of the greatest essentials of a sound and true education is religion as a part of a man's life, involved in every transaction, in every moment, and in every portion of it; and this tends to make them on the one hand, look upon it as something separate, upon which worldly prosperity is not to depend.

1192. Supposing I send my child to a day school from 9 to 12, and during that time the child is instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and he goes also in the afternoon to receive similar instruction. Suppose also that at other times I take care that that child receives proper and adequate religious instruction according to my conscientious convictions, can it be charged against me that, in that way, I am making religion a secondary matter; do not I give it importance in providing for it at other times and places?—I think the supposition is entirely inapplicable to the question upon which I have been examined. I am speaking of the education of the poor, and I have already said that one of the great obstructions to the education of the poor is indifferentism; that is, negligence from the many employments they find, and negligence amongst the parents themselves; they would not have the capability, or perhaps the solicitude, as experience of life must teach us, that you would have for your children; an anxiety for their respectability, and an anxiety for their advancement, and so on; and therefore, whatever advantage there might be in the case you suppose as applicable to yourself, would not apply to the great body of the poor.

1215. *Sir G. Grey.*—If, by the stroke of a wand, every boy and girl from 12 to 14 years of age with whom you ever come in contact as a clergyman, were able to read and to write, and to cast accounts, and describe what there was on the map, as well as the average of the persons in this room, is it your opinion that that fact would be hostile to the inculcation of Christianity amongst them, or hostile to the due* performance of all their duties in life; and when I say due performance, I do not mean as regards man and man only, but as in the presence of God?—If they had no previous knowledge of Christianity, I believe they would be just in the same condition as the Pagan world was when the Apostles began their work.

1216. You mean the condition that an educated person was in?—Yes.

1217. You would admit, that living in a state of society very unlike, there would be this difference, that they would not be brutalised by the horrid vices which were prevalent in that day; they must be free from them?—That would depend upon what was the fashion of the time.

* By error *due* is omitted.

1218. At any rate, if you could conceive of such a thing as those boys and girls being in that state of instruction, is there any reason why they should not know as much of religious matters as they know now, being in a state of almost total ignorance as regards secular learning?—I see no difference. I do think this: the greater cultivation of the mind improves the imagination, and therefore renders a person more liable to the refinements of vice; that they would be less prepared, perhaps, than the simple-minded would be; and hence we find, I think, that the simple-minded amongst the Pagans received the truths of Christianity much more quickly than the philosophers did, or the more learned; not than the very distinguished philosophers did.*

1219. You think that the habit of inquiring which the mind would retain, would be rather unfavourable to the reception of what it might be wished to teach them?—Not the habit of inquiring, but the habits of evil which are often induced without religion upon that condition of the mind.

1220. There appears to be no necessity why a man should have less religion because he can read and write, or a boy of 12 or 14; you can store up in the mind religious ideas, or religious truth, without displacing from the mind a fact in geography; and the mind of a child of 12 or 14 years of age is surely capable of taking both, and is not the less capable of taking the one because it possesses the other?—I did not say, nor would I maintain, that there would be a necessity why the boy who could read would know less of religion than the other, nor why, taking all things as equal, the boy who could read would learn it less willingly; but if a boy of 12 is brought to me who knows nothing of vice, and is willing to learn, I should more easily make impressions upon his mind of reverence for God, and impress upon him the truths of religion, than I could upon a boy who was left to read, and has read, bad books, and who is left to read, and has read, the sneers of infidelity against religion, who has read what has corrupted his mind, and made him unfit to receive the impressions of religion.

1221. You assume that the one knows nothing of vice, and that the other has been reading corrupt books; now, seeing that a state of ignorance tends very much, especially in the way in which children are brought up, to a great knowledge of vice, and that well-regulated schools would not introduce them necessarily to bad books, would you think it fair to decide the question upon the case as you have put it?—I think the Honourable Member has mistaken the answer which I gave. I had said beforehand, that in certain cases a boy that could read was under a disadvantage; and then I was asked if I thought of necessity that he should be under that disadvantage. I said, it was not of necessity, but I supposed a case in which a boy that could read, would be under a disadvantage, to justify what I said before.

We submit that the elements of comparison here suggested by Sir George Grey do not fairly exhibit the case. He is putting religious instruction in opposition to instruction strictly secular (1215), and even on this ground Mr. Toole gives him an answer; but, in fact, the comparison lies between instruction in Christianity and secular instruction saturated with deism. The manner in which he should have put the question is this: If all children of twelve or fourteen were well educated deists, would that be hostile to the inculcation and reception of Christianity? Such a question would have too strongly suggested its own answer.

Our extracts from the evidence of Mr. Toole may be concluded with the following:—

1196. *Sir G. Grey.*—I understand your opinion to be decidedly, that the best scheme of education is one which combines religious with secular instruction?—Yes; I said in the beginning that I contemplated the education of the whole man, body and soul, for the object for which he is created.

* We suspect some misprint in the last clause of this answer.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE LOCAL AND SECULAR SCHEMES COMPARED.

As if aware that the cause of secular education was making but slender progress in the Committee in respect of its own merits, the advocates of this system took every occasion of putting it into comparison with the Local scheme, and of asking the adverse witnesses which—if one must be had—they would prefer. Thus to Mr. Toole.

1181. *Chairman.*—Would you prefer that those 18,000 Roman-catholic children, who are now unprovided with education, should be allowed to be absent from school, rather than that they should be attending a school where they could receive secular instruction ?—I am not to adopt what I believe to be evil, if I cannot attain what I consider to be good.

1182. Is it evil to teach children reading and writing, seeing that they would be left to receive their religious instruction then, the same as now, from their priests ?—I should consider it an evil, to be estimated according to the effects it would produce, to give children just that which I believe would tend to produce what has been before characterised as indifferentism, or deism, or irreligion.

1183. Would there be a great tendency to indifferentism or deism, by bringing children into a school, and giving them that instruction which is common to all schools, rather than leaving them in the streets to be trained up in idleness and dirt ?—I am free from that responsibility ; it is not my doing to leave them so ; I exert myself to the last. I would lay down my life for them, to preserve them in the faith which I believe to be requisite for their eternal salvation ; and if others step in, and interpose between me and them, or mulct them with the penalty of ignorance on account of their religious faith, it is not for me to be responsible for that.

Thus to Mr. Kennedy.

1367. *Chairman.*—You have said, that rather than do nothing, if this plan of having a general system of religious schools failed, you would have no objection to secular schools ; that you would rather have them than nothing ? —If the question was between no schools at all, and what is meant by the secular schools, I should be in favour of the secular schools.

Thus to Mr. Horner.

1484. *Chairman.*—Supposing you could neither teach one religion nor all religions, what other course would you adopt ?—Certainly secular education is far better than our present state.

Thus to Mr. Hinton.

1610. *Chairman.*—Supposing Parliament should pass a law enabling corporations to raise rates for the support of schools, which would you prefer, the support of all kinds of religious teaching, or the establishment of such a system as is contemplated under the National Public School Association Bill ?—I should think both calamities, but the latter the least of the two.

1611. You would prefer the least calamity of the two ?—Yes.

1612. What is commonly called the secular system ?—Yes.

And thus to Mr. Salter.

1857. *Chairman.*—If it is to choose between secular schools and none ?—It is much better to have the secular than none.

To us who witnessed it, the constant reiteration of this interrogatory, and the eagerness evidently displayed to obtain the concession which generally followed it, were quite amusing. The Chairman, who was always as careful

to play this card as though it was the best in his hand, seemed to chuckle with delight over its success—we could not tell why then, nor can we tell why now, since the concession so anxiously extracted seems to us to yield little support to the secular scheme. We make them welcome to it, however, and take their eager acceptance of it as an amiable instance of thankfulness for small favours.

As it appears to us, the reason why a system of state schools on the Secular plan may be deemed "a less calamity" (to use Mr. Hinton's phrase) than a system of state schools on the Local plan, will be at once apparent if these names are translated into their proper meaning. A system of state schools being a calamity under any form, it is a less calamity to have one that teaches no religion, than one that teaches all religions. This is the proposition; and its proof lies in this, that a school system teaching all religions inflicts a double violation of the rights of conscience—one on the tax-payer, who is thus constrained actively to propagate religious sentiments which he abhors; and another on the child, who will sometimes be constrained to receive religious sentiments which his natural guardian abhors. A school system which teaches no religion is at least clear from these objections; and as these are the only violations of the rights of conscience which have been alleged, the advocates of the secular scheme have somewhat loudly boasted that their plan is free from all *conscientious* objection. On this point, however, a long and obstinate battle was fought in the Committee in the course of Dr. Watts's examination, of which we would give the whole did not the necessity of economizing space so heavily press upon us. The following extracts will be a sufficient sample of it.

568. *Chairman.*—What are your views of the rights of Conscience?—I think I shall be able to show that, under the plan proposed by the National Public School Association, the rights of conscience might be perfectly guaranteed. . . I am aware that the Nonconformist objects on the ground of conscience to a tax-supported religion; his reason for it is lest he should uphold and perpetuate error, and thus be found fighting against God. He objects also on political grounds, because establishments tend to corruption. But it seems to me, that if the true faith could be demonstrably reduced to form, and rendered generally acceptable, inasmuch as the obligation to accept the right is universal, there could be no objection on the ground of conscience to support it even by taxation. The political objection would still remain.

572. But might it not be in reference to conscience that a religious man would require that the education should be religious that the State gave?—A man's conscience may require that his child should be religiously educated according to his own faith, but he cannot require that I who differ with him should teach this faith, for that would be to require me to do violence to my own conscience; yet it may be for our mutual advantage that I should teach some things to his child upon the value of which we are mutually agreed. His claim for religious teaching clearly lies at home, with himself; his conscience requires it, and his conscience must supply it; or else it lies with the religious sect to which he belongs. I cannot agree with Mr. Entwistle, that we have done the most important thing when we have guarded the conscience of the parents, because by his acceptation we give parents the power to oblige ratepayers to do wrong. To me it appears that we ought wholly to abstain from doing or enforcing the wrong; we ought only to enforce that which is confessedly for the advantage of all, but we ought to put no hindrance in the way of people themselves supplementing the common work with whatever further teaching appears to them to be necessary. I think we steer quite clear of the argument on the ground of conscience, if we give time and opportunity for the common teaching to be supplemented by religious persons whose

consciences require dogmatical religious teaching. We then neither enforce the wrong, nor prevent the right, and that, I think, is all the liberty that a religious man's conscience can require.

675. *Mr. Christopher.*—You said it was not a religious objection, but a political objection; what is your definition of a political objection?—I explained in my former examination, and will now repeat, that in all secular matters we are guided by experience, in religious matters we are guided by conscience. In matters which are not the subject of experience, any objection that is put would be a religious objection; in matters which are the subject of experience, or in which there is common agreement, any objection will be a political objection, and will not apply to what we commonly call conscience.

676. *Marquis of Blandford.*—Should you not say that an objection to a secular system from there being an absence of religious doctrinal teaching inculcated with it, would be a conscientious objection rather than a political objection?—It will be a conscientious objection in the sense of its being a real objection which the individual feels, but it will not be an objection on the ground of conscience in the religious sense; because, if I read over the whole of the subjects which will be taught in a secular school, no one, whatever may be his religious opinions, will be able to take objection to those subjects, and therefore his conscience will not be violated by the teaching.

947. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—Do you not think the same conscientious scruples may exist to the omission or suppression of truth as the teaching of error?—I have stated very fully, in reply to questions in my former examination, that, in my view, an objection on the ground of conscience must be either to the positive suppression of truth, so that it cannot possibly be taught, or it must be to the enforcing of error. Our schools would only occupy given hours during the day, and the conscience which required religious teaching would supply it in other hours.

948. If my conscience tells me that the whole of teaching ought to be combined with the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, then you would not consider me as worthy of consideration?—I do not think your conscience can tell you any such thing. I can perfectly conceive that your conscience may require Christian teaching, but your conscience cannot require that it should be given between the hours of 9 and 12, and 2 and 4; since any time previous to 9, or between 12 and 2, or after 4, that teaching might be given, and your conscience might supply it.

949. *Mr. Bowyer.*—May not my conscience object to morality being taught without religion, if I think that all morality ought to be taught as arising from religion?—If your conscience objects to morality *per se*, the objection is a good one; but your conscience cannot object to a thing that is good *per se*, because it is not connected with a thing that is equally good or better *per se*.

961. *Mr. Cobden.*—Do you think that there is any rational being in the world who would prefer a man to remain a drunkard rather than become a sober man, unless he could at the same time convert him for a special religious motive?—Not according to my notions of rationality.

To us it seems, that in the battle thus eagerly fought there was a good deal of logomachy; but we cannot think that it was fairly won by Mr. Cobden. He evidently overlooked the essential circumstance, that the discussion related to the education as a whole of the working classes, and forgot that the question was whether by far the larger part of it should be carried on without an infusion of the higher religious motives. To this, undoubtedly, a person may most conscientiously, that is to say, most sincerely and strongly object; but that it is a violation of the rights of conscience in any direction is not obvious. If this question arises at all, it arises on the fact, that, while professing to teach no religion, Secular schools may teach, under the name of the religion common to all sects, systematic deism. Now this is as positive a form of religious teaching as any that could be carried on under the Local bill, and it consequently

would involve as real a violation of the religious liberty of the child on whom it was enforced, and of the rate-payer who was compelled to support it.

We cannot close this chapter without repudiating Dr. Watts's totally inadequate conception of the principle of religious liberty. In 570 he lays it down that "the state has no right to take cognizance of religion except the people be all of one religion;" but in that case he thinks the right of the state is unquestionable. Several times in the course of his evidence we meet with the same statement, and in 568 the spiritual despotism of the pilgrim fathers of New England is adduced in illustration of it! Dr. Watts, of course, speaks to the best of his knowledge; all we have to say is, that he must not be understood to speak for us.

---

## CHAPTER. XI.

### ON COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

Upon this subject, which is one of great importance and of growing interest, the following evidence was given by Mr. Bazley.

216. *Mr. Peto.*—I understand your opinion to be, that you do not object to children being compelled to attend at some school?—I have no objection to it.

217. *Sir G. Grey.*—Does the scheme which you advocate involve a provision for the compulsory attendance of the children at the schools?—I think it does not. I think, however, it would be a compulsion which would lead to the benefit of the children, as well as to the benefit of the community, and I should exercise it very discreetly, I hope, and very carefully and cautiously; but if the parent did not provide for the education of the child according to his own views and sentiments, then there should be some superintending power that should discriminate whether a certain child should be sent to a public or national school, or not. I think a discrimination should be exercised, and the discriminating power be given to some Board, or other authority.

218. *Mr. Christopher.*—How would you enforce it; would you enforce it by means of penalties upon the parents?—I would have a discriminating Board, which might be appealed to if a parent did not give his child an education.

219. Supposing the parent were to refuse do so?—Under certain circumstances, I would say that the child should not be left in a state of ignorance, but must go to school.

272. *Mr. Bowyer.*—I understand that you would make attendance upon secular instruction compulsory?—To a certain extent.

273. Would you make attendance upon religious instruction compulsory also?—We do not make any proposition with reference to religious instruction at all; we say it is not our duty.

274. That is not a part of your system?—No; we say the ministers of religion and the parents of the children should look after that.

275. You leave that entirely to the parents and the ministers of religion, while you do not leave secular instruction equally optional?—Quite so, we think the public have a vital and perceptible interest in a well educated people.

276. Do not you think the public have an interest in the people having some religion?—No doubt the public are interested in their being a well ordered and well conducted people, and I do not think there can be a well conducted and a well ordered people without some religious principle to guide them.

277. Then the pnblic will have an interest in seeing that the children have some religious instruction?—Yes.

The same subject was thus referred to in the examination of Dr M'Kerrow.

368. *Mr. Peto.*—What is your own impression with regard to compulsory attendance?—In reference to a religious system, of course, I must decidedly oppose everything like compulsory attendance. We imagine that if we had free schools, we should influence a very large number of parents to send their children to school, and of course diminish the number of those who are now receiving no instruction. But it might be that still there was a considerable class who could not be influenced even by gratuitous education, and hence we have proposed that a machinery should be employed in each school district to enter into the houses of the poor, and to endeavour to persuade the parents to send their children to school, the instruction being gratuitous. But if after all these there be still a class who would not avail themselves of the advantages thus freely afforded to them (I express now simply my own opinion, because the National Public School Association has expressed no opinion with regard to it), I have no hesitation in saying I should be disposed to employ some species of compulsion. I do not see any right that any individual has to bring up his children to be a nuisance to society.

384. You stated just now, that you personally (I am not at all pledging the National Public School Association) had no objection to compulsory school attendance; under what circumstances, and by what means should coercion be enforced?—I am not prepared to specify the way in which it would be best to secure that attendance; but still, as the honourable Chairman has already referred to, there is compulsory attendance in so far as factory operatives are concerned, because they must attend school otherwise they cannot obtain employment in the factories; and perhaps some provision of that sort might be tried with effect. In Holland it is declared, I believe, that no person who neglects the instruction of his children shall receive any benefit from the parish poor-rate, and that is considered a strong inducement on the part of the parents to send their children to school.

385. Do you think that the country at large is at all prepared for such a compulsory system?—I think that the country is to a large extent prepared, because almost every person with whom I have had any conversation says, if after having made these schools free schools, you cannot induce the children of a certain class to attend, it will be necessary to employ some species of compulsion to get them.

386. *Chairman.*—Is there any reason why greater regard should be had for the education of the children of factory operatives than for the children of other portions of the working classes?—Certainly not.

And further on in Dr. M'Kerrow's examination, after he has admitted the large amount of truancy by which the provision for supplementary religious instruction would be vitiated, we find the following.

448. *Mr. Miles.*—Then this attendance of a day and a half for religious education must be compulsory in that case, must it not?—No, I should have no compulsion in reference to attendance on religious instruction.

449. From what you have stated, would there not be the greatest difficulty in getting children of this class to attend the day and a half, supposing the secular education was compulsory, for the religious education, supposing that was not compulsory?—There would with a certain class of children exist that difficulty, unquestionably.

450. Taking Manchester, would not that be a considerable class?—Yes, I imagine that would be a considerable class, but still I think that the great object is accomplished in having the children brought to the secular school, and in proportion as they receive instruction in that school, so, I think, they would be able to receive, and be disposed to receive, additional instruction from all religious exercises.

451. As members of a religious community, should we not be bound in Christian duty to do all we could for such children; to inculcate into their

minds at any rate the doctrines of pure and revealed religion ? — Most unquestionably ; but that, I think, is to be done by voluntary effort, by that principle which leads us now to exert ourselves on behalf of all classes of persons in bringing them to our Sabbath Schools, and in visiting them, and distributing tracts, and which would just lead us to do what we could to extend religious influence among them by whatever agencies were deemed to be suitable.

452. But as there would be a considerable number, who, from different causes specified by yourself, would not be led to attend these schools, how could we hope that proper religious instruction, the attendance not being compulsory in these schools, would be instilled into the minds of these children ?—I do not think, under any system, we can reach the lower class of the people.

Dr. Watts, in his account of the operation of the Secular Bill, gave the following explanation.

827. They would appoint visitors for the destitute districts, who might be either the existing town missionaries or persons not otherwise employed; and these visitors would take an exact account of the destitute children in their districts. Wherever simple poverty was the cause of absence from school, the parents would be persuaded to send their children to the free schools, such consistent representations of the value of education being made to them, as in the judgment of the visitor would best secure this result ; where the destitution was such as to oblige the children to resort to begging under any of its various forms, the cases would be reported to the school committee, and by them to the magistrate, and orders would be obtained for their admission to the industrial schools. Magistrates would also send juvenile vagrants from the dock to the schools ; and I think it would be well to extend this power to boards of guardians also, who should send there the juvenile recipients of out-door relief. I would here remark, that subsequent to the passing of this Bill, the laws relating to vagrancy and street hawking might be enforced, and by this means the streets would be swept clean of juvenile vagrants. At present the law makes begging a crime, but magistrates are too kind-hearted to put the law in force in the case of young persons. By these means, then, all the compulsion that will ever be necessary would be got to work.

He was subsequently examined on this point.

883. *Mr. Miles.*—You have alluded to visitors in your answer ; will you specify in what way you would use your visitors ?— Under the national public school plan, we take power for the school committee to appoint visitors to go from door to door throughout the whole district. Those visitors would take an exact account of the destitute children, and of those who did not go to school; and they would urge the parents, where simple poverty was the cause of neglect, to send their children to school. They would report the destitute cases to the school committees; the school committees would get magistrates' orders, and send them to the industrial schools.

884. Then you take a compulsory power, as regards destitute children, to send them to the industrial schools ?—Not a directly compulsory power, but the school committee would require a magistrate's order for their admission. The magistrates would also be asked to put the vagrancy laws into force after the passing of the Bill, and that would answer our purpose.

885. Then you use no more stringent measures than the Aberdeen magistrates took to clear Aberdeen ?—No, certainly not; and they have been quite effectual.

Mr. Kennedy was examined on the same point.

1326. *Mr. Miles.*—Then if free schools were established, probably you think

the same indifference would be shown as now ?—I am afraid it would be by great numbers ; but, at the same time, a free school, again, would be a reason for putting some compulsion upon their going to school. You could then say to them, " You are now at no expense ; you have no excuse on the ground of want of funds for not going ; therefore, if you do not go, you must submit to such and such a penalty." That seems to be the argument in favour of free schools.

1327. Then are you ready to adopt the principle of compulsion immediately, supposing free schools be adopted ?—It appears to me, if free schools are adopted, that some semi-compulsion of that kind might well be adopted.

1328. *Mr. W. Fox.*—Should you think regularity of attendance a reasonable condition upon enjoying the advantages of the schools ?—I meant more than that ; I meant I would punish the parent to some extent, for not sending his child.

1329. *Mr. Miles.*—Do you think that that would be generally approved of throughout the country ?—I hope it would in time.

1330. Would it not, in a certain way, take away the right of the parent to do what he pleased with his children ?—Only to a limited extent ; he might send it to what school he liked ; he must make his choice of one ; I would put no restriction on that.

1331. But still if these free schools were established, you would recommend that he should be subjected to a penalty unless he sent his children to school ? —I think I would. The parent might be fined ; or, a certain amount of knowledge in a boy might be required as a condition in every indenture of apprenticeship.

1332. *Mr. K. Seymer.*—To what class of parents would you apply that rule ? —I do not know that I would exempt any.

1393. *Mr. Miles.*—Would you make the attendance of such children so paid for out of the rates compulsory ?—I would.

1394. Have you at all turned in your mind the machinery by which you would do that ?—In former years I have, by which I would get the attendance of those children. I have always thought there should be a kind of relieving officer for the education of the poor, as there is for feeding them ; and that we should go into the highways and hedges, as far as we can, to lay hold of such children, and send them to school.

1395. *Sir G. Grey.*—You have not quite explained how you would enforce the attendance of the children ?—I would make it a condition of out-door relief to the parent.

1396. The parent should only be entitled to relief upon condition of sending the child to school ?—Yes.

1397. *Mr. Miles.*—Probably you would hold out this inducement, that the payment from the parent should not be lessened, but the payment should be increased, by so many children paying 2d. for their education ?—Yes, by an *additional* payment ; I never contemplated anything else.

1398. Do you conceive that that, together with the notice that if these children were not sent to school, the parents receiving out-door relief would be ordered to be inmates of the poorhouse, as the only means by which they should hereafter receive relief, would be sufficient ?—I think it would be.

1399. *Sir G. Grey.*—Would you apply the principle of compulsion to any other cases than those of children of parents receiving parish relief ?—I think not in the present state of education ; not at present.

And, finally, Mr. Cuffe, in his letter inserted in the Appendix, refers to the same matter in the following terms.

It is my opinion that there must be some kind of compulsion ; something similar to that employed by a large establishment in this city, where no child receives employment who is not able to read. I have now on the books of my school upwards of 60 free children, and latterly the attendance has on the whole been better than that of the paying scholars. How is this to be accounted for ? The parents are informed that unless their children attend

regularly, their names will be removed from the books, and that they will lose the privilege. But the children themselves are anxious to come, and their parents to send them, and such will be the case wherever the quality of the instruction is good.—*Appendix*, p. 267.

We do not know that we have anything to add on this subject to the following remarks by Mr. Hinton.

On Compulsory School Attendance.

1. While neither the Local nor the Secular Bill has contained any provision for compelling school attendance, the subject has repeatedly come up in the examination of the witnesses, as it is well known to have been cautiously treated by the friends of both measures out of doors. The Rev. C. Richson and Mr. Entwisle, to their honour, as I think, expressed an unqualified deprecation of it; but Dr. M'Kerrow and Mr. Bazley have declared themselves in favour of it. Upon this it is obvious to observe that it is tantamount to a confession that the Bills, as drawn, are unadapted, and will be inefficient, for their purpose —a severe sentence to be passed upon them by their promoters. Further, it exposes the parties to a charge of want of candour. With all their apparent frankness, it oozes out that they have not told their whole mind; but that something lurks behind which they have been altogether afraid to put into either Bill, and which they have been afraid even to talk about, except in a whisper. It had been much more fair to have avowed this opinion at once, and to have given it a substantial embodiment.

2. The tenderness of this ground becomes manifest when the mode of practically exercising a power of coercion is approached. Mr. Bazley, after premising that "he would (he hoped) exercise such a power very discreetly, and very carefully and cautiously," (217) proposed the following plan: "I would have a discriminating Board, which might be appealed to if a parent did not give his child education," (218). I cannot think of such a Board, or, rather, of the many hundreds, or perhaps thousands, of such Boards which, on this plan, must be called into existence through the country, without a feeling of curiosity as to the rules by which the respected gentlemen, who, of course, like Mr. Bazley, would be "very cautious and discreet," would be guided in determining whether a child was duly educated or not, and whether or not sufficient reasons existed for his or her not going to school at a particular time. The attendance of numerous witnesses, and the gravity with which various interesting incidents of domestic life must be gone into by the Board, could scarcely fail to elevate this into an important part of our judicial system, albeit of somewhat slow operation, and materially obstructive to industry. Should the Board ever arrive at the conclusion, however, that a certain child ought to be sent to school, Mr. Bazley has left us quite in the dark as to the means by which their decision is to be enforced; so perplexed and helpless are even wise and benevolent men, when they would transfer parental duties to other hands, and supersede the ordinances of God.

3. It was well asked of Dr. M'Kerrow (448), whether compulsory attendance on secular instruction could be separated from compulsory attendance on religious instruction. The reverend gentleman, of course, made strong and reiterated assertions that he would not have attendance on religious instruction made compulsory; but he substantially acknowledged the difficulty (444 to 452). Indeed, it seems clear that children who will not go to receive secular instruction without being compelled, will not go to receive religious instruction without being compelled; and consequently that the entire class who need compulsion will get nothing but a secular education, and be, so far as relates to religious instruction, totally destitute and abandoned, unless compelled to attend on that also. If, however, we are to begin a course of compulsory attendance on religious instruction, some very grave questions will immediately arise, both of principle and practice; since, on the one hand, it is not easy to see where it may end, and since, on the other, it is not easy to reconcile it in any form with the rights of conscience, or the possession of religious liberty.

4. It is a serious question, however, whether a system of compulsory school attendance would be tolerated in England. In answer to Question 385, "Do you think that the country at large is at all prepared for such a system?" Dr. M'Kerrow innocently answered, "I think it is to a large extent; because almost every person with whom I have had any conversation says, if, after having made these schools free schools, you cannot induce the children of a certain class to attend, it will be necessary to employ some species of compulsion to get them."* As an explicit testimony to the inefficiency of the rate-free-school scheme, these conversations may have their value, but they can go a very little way, I conceive, towards proving the acceptableness to "the country at large" of a system of compulsory school attendance. On the other hand, the Rev. H. W. Bellair, school inspector, in his Report for 1851, distinctly admits that the country is not prepared for such a system (Minutes, 1852, v. 2, p. 83); and the Rev. W. Kennedy, school inspector, whose strong bearing towards a compulsory system (1327, 1328) I observe with regret, thinks it is only "after a time" that Englishmen would be reconciled to it, and he would not introduce it at present, (1329, 1399). I must do Dr. Watts the justice to note that he repudiated all idea of compulsion, except with regard to a criminal class, that of juvenile vagrants, with respect to whom I offer no objection to it. In my opinion, anything more out of harmony with English institutions, or doing greater violence to English habits and feelings, than a general system of compulsory school attendance for the working classes, can scarcely be conceived; and I think that a consciousness of its hateful character lurks under the extreme caution with which it has been spoken of.

5. But even if it were not offensive to popular feeling, there are grave objections to such a system, to which deep consideration ought to be given. A conjunction between the schoolmaster and the constable is surely one of the most infelicitous nature. In the aspect of the school everything should be attractive, and in school instruction everything should be kind; but a system of compulsion would tend to make the school an object of dread and aversion. While at school, children should be willing to apply themselves to school exercises; but this could not be expected from children going there under coercion. In a word, a system of compulsory attendance would at once convert the school into a prison; the children so taken to it would be treated as offenders without a fault, would stand disgraced among their companions, and be in the worst possible state of mind for receiving instruction. Persuasive measures are greatly to be preferred to such a system as this.

6. Mr. Bellair, in his Report for 1851, already referred to, while repudiating the idea of compulsion, insists on the wisdom of "subjecting the uneducated to civil disabilities," and of "holding out to the educated either political or commercial rewards." I cannot agree with Mr. Bellair, for the following reasons: First, I think that "civil disabilities are essentially penal, and should be annexed only to crime. Secondly, I think that rewards of various kinds are already attached to education by the arrangements of society, and this to as great an extent as is likely to be really beneficial. Where these have no effect, rewards offered by law would have none. Thirdly, such a system must work ill, by detaching education from other attributes. Under it you might punish a worthy man because he could not read, and reward a villain because he could. Fourthly, any system of this kind would require, under the circumstances, not only a difficult, but an impossible thing—a definition of education. What the law should define as such it would be hard to say; but this is certain, that no definition could be universally appropriate. The effect, indeed, of such an attempt would infallibly be rather to lower education than to elevate it; since the standard must be fixed at a low point lest the system should be too exclusive, and this would tend to paralyse all efforts to rise above it.—*Appendix*, pp. 241, 242.

* By error the last clause of this sentence is omitted.

# CONCLUSION.

Among the most obvious general remarks which our survey of the Secular scheme suggests, this perhaps is the first, that it is to an extraordinary degree wanting in distinct outline and character. What liberties, for example, are taken with the word *secular*, its most prominent appellative! Johnson, under this word, gives the following as the first meaning of it—"Secular, not spiritual." In this sense it is sometimes obviously used in the papers before us, while at other times it means a great deal about God and a future world. In the proposed bill, the word secular is put in opposition, not (as it ought to be) to what is religious, but to "doctrinal" religion, no one being able to say what doctrinal religion is. If you take the phrase absolutely, you exclude the being of a God, which is a doctrine, but which, however, is not to be excluded; and if you take it in a qualified sense, you get into equal difficulty. Doctrinal religion, the bill tells us, consists of "sectarian" opinions; but then, again, we have to ask what opinions are sectarian. The bill replies that they are opinions "in favour of, or in opposition to, the peculiarities of any sect of Christians;" and thus we have Christianity as the common ground to be occupied, and the peculiarities of Christian sects as the matters to be avoided. This, however, would make the word secular comprehend, not only natural religion (as affirmed by Dr. Watts), but revealed religion also, which would be a further stretch of it; but here we are encountered by Dr. M'Kerrow, who tells us point blank that Christianity is to be excluded from secular schools. A little further on we run against Dr. Watts, who assures us that by the term sect he does not mean (like the bill) Christian sects, but all "the various religions" existing in the country: on this point, however, Dr. Watts is knocked down by his own party; for Mr. Cuffe informs us that in secular schools "the moral precepts of the gospel and the historical portions of the Scripture may be given by the teacher, but without reference to the peculiar tenets or dogmas which distinguish the sects"—meaning, evidently, the Christian sects. Dr. M'Kerrow eschews "merely the distinctive kind of religion which separates between Roman Catholics and Protestants, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Jews and Christians;" going, as our readers will perceive, a little further than Mr. Cuffe in his charity for the Jews, but not so awfully far as Dr. Watts. Yet, even confining sectarian opinions to the "differential doctrines" (a favourite phrase of Dr. Watts's) of "the Christian sects," we do not see our way very clearly, for these Christian sects being "Roman Catholics and Protestants, Trinitarians and Unitarians," it seems that the great, and (as we have been used to think) the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity—of the Trinity, the atonement, and justification by faith—must be reckoned sectarian, and excluded accordingly.

We could lead our readers much further through this wordy maze, but we will put their patience to no severer test. We only ask, what clearness of thought can there be where there is no definiteness in the use of words? And what kind of system must that be for which no appellative can be either found or framed, and which no two of its advocates can describe in

the same terms? To our minds here is a rich illustration of Mr. Cobden's piquant saying two years ago, that the promoters of Secular education are not yet arrived at a point at which they can say what Secular education is. And yet they want to support it by general taxation, and to make it universal! Time enough, gentlemen, time enough!

To this observation we may add another, which complicates the case still further, and makes it materially worse. The Secular scheme as advocated in the Committee is not in any one of its forms what is expected, and what will be insisted on, by many of its friends out of doors. The public character and language of some of its principal advocates have demonstrated, that what they aim at and demand is a system of education strictly secular, without any intermixture of religion at all, a scheme for which no witness before the Committee had the courage to plead. In this respect there has been shown, we think, a great want of frankness and candour; and at the same time, there is afforded a pretty fair index of what all the talk about religion in the Committee would come to in the practical working of the measure, should such a bill ever be unfortunately carried.

The observation now made may serve to throw some light on Dr. Watts's boast, that the scheme is pre-eminently popular. He tells us of no less than one hundred and fifty public meetings at which he has triumphantly carried the day. But let us be permitted to ask, what view of the intended measure has he given? Has he told the people who may have attended these meetings that the instruction is to be strictly secular, leaving religion absolutely alone, as in the Birkbeck schools? Or has he told them that the national schools are to be leavened with the principles of natural religion, and made seminaries of systematic deism? We might multiply questions of this class, but, after the view we have taken of the evidence, it cannot be necessary. We can easily imagine that so talented a man as Dr. Watts can make a plausible statement of his case; but that the English public will endorse the scheme of the National Public School Association when they understand it, is, we confess, beyond our belief.

In this respect, we think the public feeling has been much more accurately gauged by Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, who, in his work on Public Education, has used the following language:—"No scheme of public education could be more extravagantly rash and arrogant, than one which would either venture to overlook the religious origin, or the existence and peculiar organization, of so great a number of schools. In these facts lies the strength of the so-called '*voluntary*' party, and as a protest against the unjustifiable tyranny of crushing these schools under rival institutions, supported by the wealth and power of the State, or against their separation from the government of the church or congregation, and the extinction of dogmatic religious teaching in them, the exertions of that party are entitled to the public gratitude. It would be difficult to conceive, that any man of parliamentary experience could gravely propose, that local municipal boards should be invested with power to establish rate-supported schools in every parish, with whatever coustitution, to the inevitable destruction of the schools of religious communions—much less, that the constitution of the new schools should exclude all distinctive religious instruction. We should rather be amused than alarmed, if any public man should offer, as a boon to the religious bodies (in whose instinctive religious feeling the existing schools originated), to purchase or hire their school buildings, in order to appropriate them to a purely secular use. Happily, there is no majority in this country strong enough to perpetrate so gross an outrage."—P. 36.

We pass now to another general observation. The great boast of the Secular educationists has been that their scheme renders a tax-supported system of public schools compatible with religious freedom and the rights of conscience; a point in which, as we have shown in our former pamphlet, the Local plan altogether fails; and that thus it, at last, gets over the religious difficulty, by which all efforts towards a national system of education have been so seriously embarrassed. Now, it may be observed that, as allowing the inculcation of the doctrines of natural religion, the Secular system has no advantage whatever over the Local, since it proposes to tax the community for a mode of religious teaching, and for a mode of religious teaching far indeed from being universally acceptable—too much for some people, and a great deal too little for others. Even, however, if this were not so, and if it were to be admitted that under the secular scheme the rights of conscience would not be infringed, it must be maintained that this advantage is to be purchased at far too high a price, namely, the entire exclusion of evangelical Christianity from the school routine. This, if not a violation of conscience, is a tremendous injury to the scholastic institute, especially considered as the vital and ruling element in a system of national schools for the entire working classes of England. The religious difficulty, therefore, although changed in form, yet remains, after these two modes of treating it have done their best. Is there a third mode of attempting its solution? On this question Mr. Hinton was thus examined.

1617. *Chairman.*—Are you acquainted with any other method in which the treatment of the religious difficulty attaching. to a system of general education has been attempted ?—Mr. Tremenheere, in the work just quoted, exhibits the method adopted of late years in Upper Canada.

1618. Have you formed an opinion of that method ?—I have formed an opinion of it only to this extent, that I suppose no party would wish its introduction here.

When Mr. Hinton gave this answer, he had not observed that Dr. M'Kerrow in his evidence (518) had referred to the educational condition of Canada as yielding support to the secular scheme. His words are—"The principles of the National Public School Association are similar to those which are acknowledged to be just and beneficial in . . . Upper Canada." Dr. M'Kerrow is, we believe, the first and only person who has ventured on making such a reference, and he has assuredly done it without due information. Any one who will take the trouble to look at the Canadian system as developed by Mr. Tremenheere in his Notes on Public Subjects, will soon be satisfied on this point; but for those who have not an opportunity of doing this, we may just mention one provision of it

"By the 19th section of the act it is provided, that, 'on the application in writing of 12 or more resident families,' the school trustees are authorized to established a separate school, in case the teacher of the existing school, being a Protestant or a Roman Catholic, is of a different religious denomination from the applicants."* The formation of such schools is

* Section 19. And be it enacted that it shall be the duty of the municipal council of any township, and of the Board of School Trustees of any city, town, or incorporated village, on the application in writing of twelve or more resident heads of families, to authorize the establishment of one or more separate schools for Protestants, Roman Catholics, or coloured people; and in such case it shall prescribe the limits of the divisions or sections for such schools, and shall make the same provision for the holding of the first meeting for the election of trustees of each such separate school, or schools, as is

decidedly discouraged by the law, under which (to use the words of Dr. Ryerson) "a separate school is entitled to no aid beyond a certain portion of the school fund for the salary of the teacher; the school-house must be provided, furnished, warmed, books procured, &c., by the persons petitioning for the separate school; and the patrons and supporters of a separate school are not exempted from any of the local assessments or rates for common school purposes:" yet, so valuable is this provision for separate denominational schools considered, that, in the face of this discouragement, their number is continually on the increase. In Dr. Ryerson's report they are stated at 59, a number which shows an increase of 27 above the return of the previous year. We may safely leave it to Dr. M'Kerrow, who certainly should have taken care to inform himself better on the subject before he spoke, to say whether this is very much like the Secular system, and to the friends of the Secular system at large to say whether they would wish to introduce such a plan into England.

The various modes by which the solution of the religious difficulty has been attempted having been thus found unsatisfactory, the following important questions were put to Mr. Hinton.

1619. *Chairman.*—Do you think, then, that the religious difficulty is an insoluble element in the question of national education in England?—I do.

1624. You state that this religious difficulty is incapable of solution; how is it that you have come to that conclusion, when you see that there is a system of national education in various other countries, in which the religious difficulty has been got over?—My reason for coming to this conclusion in reference to England particularly, is the very pecular condition of its population in relation to religious questions. Nothing like it exists anywhere else in the whole world. In the United States the Church establishment is wanting. On the Continent freedom of thought and of worship is wanting. Even in Scotland and Ireland the multiplicity and nearly balanced power of religious denominations are wanting. On this ground, I hold it to be altogether vain to attempt to copy from other nations in this matter. Our educational system must be our own.

1625. And what, in your opinion, must it be?—IT MUST BE THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM. MY CONVICTION IS, THAT NO OTHER WILL BE FOUND PRACTICABLE IN THIS COUNTRY.

provided in the fourth section of this Act for holding the first school meeting in a new school section: Provided, That each such separate school shall go into operation at the same time with alterations in school sections, and shall be under the same regulations in respect to the persons for whom such school is permitted to be established as are common schools generally: Provided secondly, that none but coloured people shall be allowed to vote for the election of trustees of a separate school for their children, and none but the parties petitioning for the establishment of, or sending children to, a separate Protestant or Roman Catholic school, shall vote at the election of trustees of such school: Provided thirdly, that each such separate Protestant, or Roman Catholic, or coloured school shall be entitled to share in the school fund according to the average attendance of pupils attending each such separate school (the mean attendance of pupils for both summer and winter being taken), as compared with the whole average attendance of pupils attending the common schools in each such city, town, village, or township: Provided fourthly, That no Protestant separate school shall be allowed in any school division, except where the teacher of a common school is a Roman Catholic, nor shall any Roman Catholic separate school be allowed except where the teacher of the common school is a Protestant: Provided fifthly, That the trustees of the common school sections within the limits of which such separate school section or sections shall have been formed, shall not include the children attending such separate school or schools in their return of children of school age residing in their school sections.—*Notes on Public Subjects made during a tour in the United States and Canada. By Hugh Seymour Tremenheere.* P. 248.

Without arrogating too much for the opinion of an individual, we may at least say that there is something in these answers deserving the consideration of those who employ themselves on the question of national education. It is, of course, in its practical elements that the question must be mainly regarded by statesmen and legislators. The condition of England ought as much to determine its educational as its political system. Even if this condition were wrong and to be deplored, it would be at once foolish and fruitless to fight against it; the fact must clearly be taken as it is; but we think, that in this respect the condition of England, as one of free thought and free action in religion, is mainly what it ought to be, and that it tends to give a direction to educational efforts as just in principle as it is necessary in fact. In our judgment, freedom of education is but one portion of national freedom as a whole, and it is at once intimately connected with all the rest, and absolutely essential to their preservation,

J. HADDON AND SON, PRINTERS, CASTLE STREET, FINSBURY.